CHARACTER DESCRIPTION AND SOCIO-POLITICAL APOLOGETIC IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

Robert Kenneth Mackenzie

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Edinburgh

1984

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

ABSTRACT OF THESIS (Regulation 6.9)

ne of Candidate ROBERT KENNETH MACKENZIE

ress

ree Doctor of Philosophy *Date* April 1984

e of Thesis CHARACTER DESCRIPTION AND SOCIO-POLITICAL APOLOGETIC IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

Acts has been the subject of exhaustive enquiry from historical, source, redactional, literary, and other angles. The aim of this thesis is to read Acts as would someone with an education typical of that time. The clearer it is that such rhetorical grounding was sufficient basis for an intelligible interpretation, the more likely that Acts was extroverted enough to be addressed to a general readership. Since it was the practice to interpret history in terms of individuals not general movements, as is exemplified in theoretical statements of Cicero and Seneca and in the practice of Thucydides, Sallust, Livy and Tacitus, the school exercise (προγύμνασμα) of character description (ἔκφρασις προσώπου) forms the basis of analysis and interpretation, as illustrated from 14.8-19.

By use of the theory of Theon and suitable practical examples in Homer, Sallust, Josephus, etc., the typical form of the character sketch is outlined, as are common topics (τόποι) in it as used in Acts, thus identifying the examples in Acts. With reference to such as Seneca, Tacitus, Vergil and Polybius, it is shown how this exercise was used in historiography to introduce minor, and offer obituaries of major, characters, and so it emerges that in Acts these sketches introduce the Church, and that Paul, receiving valedictory description, is the dominant figure. Reference to historiographers also identifies the use of descriptions as digressions (παρεκβάσεις) which yet advance the inquiry, 18.24-28 proving to be such a typifying digression. Adding Theon's exercise of comparison (σύγκρισις), and again with reference to Plutarch, Xenophon, Catullus, etc., 4.32-5.11 and 8.4-40 (Lucian affording a significant comparison) are shown to be like digressions. 21.37-9 and 22.25-8 are also comparisons, but 9.32-10.48 is a climactic grouping of characters. Menander's On Epideictic provides the theoretical basis for the interpretation of character sketches in travel rhetoric, and Lucan a practical instance. Situations of arrival and departure occur at 16.6-16 and 20.36-21.16. For 21.39-26.39, the theory of Cicero's De Inuentione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium on dicanic oratory form the basis for discussion of the defence speech (ἀπολογία) and its effect on characterisations within it. The themes which emerge are reviewed under the following heads: opposition and advance; resurrection; piety; a dialectical relationship with the Jews; connection with the higher echelons of society; lack of secretiveness; invitation to something with a certain mystique; innocence and justice.

Brief remarks on what Acts may have to say to the contemporary West conclude the exploration of what it said in its own time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although I necessarily owe much to many people, to my supervisors Professor Hugh Anderson and Dr Ian A. Moir, to my teachers both of Classics and of Divinity (to the published works of several of whom I refer during the course of the thesis), to family and friends who have encouraged and supported me, to my typist Mrs Doris Williamson, and particularly to Mr Roy M. Pinkerton who has been teacher, friend, and invaluable assistant in the final phases of the preparation of the thesis for presentation, the thesis itself and the views which it expresses remain wholly my own responsibility.

The Manse of Creich, Sutherland

29th February 1984

ταῖς ἐμαῖς θυγάτρασι

ταῖς διδύμαις

CONTENTS

Page

I

" 'Every act of every man - and I include thoughts, of course - had either a positive or a negative effect on the content of history. That is how the line of history is bent up or down - by every act of every man. We all in fact are making history with every breath we draw. Whether we know it, or like it, or consent to it, or not.'

'Gad, Ewen, you frighten me. That's a terrible weight of responsibility to lay on every poor fellow's shoulders.' "

Fionn MacColla
"The Ministers"

CHAPTER I

ANGLE AND METHOD : INDIVIDUALISM AND RHETORIC

Whether 'The Acts of the Apostles' is an esoteric or an exoteric work is a matter of some significance. Of all the books in the New Testament it is the one that was most plausibly intended for a readership at least partly outside the Church, and is therefore the one most likely to save the New Testament from the introversion of being entirely by the Church for the Church. Undoubtedly it could be demonstrated that there is in other parts of the New Testament extroversion of understanding and statement, that a concern is expressed not just for the Church but for the world. Nevertheless, it remains true that if at least the possibility of an extroversion of practice as well as of theory cannot be held open for Acts, it is improbable that it can be held open for any other work in the New Testament.

It is the purpose of this thesis to explore something of what the Greek-speaking non-churchman of around the turn of the first century of the Christian era might have made of the Book of Acts, should a copy have come into his hands. The analysis presented will confirm that he could have made something of it. Certain things, however, necessarily remain beyond the possibility of demonstration. Without the discovery of a writer who makes a more or less plain statement that he read the work, there can be no certainty that anyone outside the Church ever did read it - whether or not that was Luke's intention. Without similar new

discovery, it is extremely hard to judge whether or not such a reader would have found the book persuasive, as opposed to being able to recognise a presentation that was intended to affect him.

Luke's own intention in the matter is perhaps almost equally difficult of demonstration. It is hard enough to be sure of the true motivation or purpose of a contemporary, far less of an individual and essentially anonymous figure two thousand years distant in history. It is hard enough to interpret a work through the eyes, so to say, of the man in the library of two thousand years ago, without claiming to enter into the frame of mind of one particular individual of that time on the strength of one fairly brief literary production. Hence, although for the sake of simplicity of expression it will be assumed from the beginning that Luke wrote and intended his writing to be understood as the educated Greek-speaking reader would have understood him, the establishment of the case for this depends in fair measure on how extensively and in what degree of detail the following analyses fit the text. The more tightly and the more generally the analysis proves appropriate, the more likely it is that Luke wrote that way and intended himself to be so understood.

The primary purpose of this thesis is, then, more modest than to say what Luke thought. It is to explore how we may reasonably suppose that he would have been understood by his educated contemporaries, primarily those outside the Church, and probably also, to some extent at least, by people within

the Church. If it can be shown that someone outside the Church could have made good sense of Acts with the assistance only of a standard education, then, of course, that significantly affects judgment on the probabilities of Luke's intentions. But it is only in so far as his thoughts are so illuminated that they will come in for any consideration. Consequently, for example, although Luke may have written in the light of a quite broadly developed theological understanding, it is only in so far as it is exposed by the type of analysis the ancient layman would have applied that his theology will be discussed.

The possible extroverted or apologetic purpose of Acts has been debated for some time. Haenchen gives a concise history of the study of Acts in the introduction to his commentary,[1] and more recently Maddox has included a survey of views in his '<u>The Purpose of Luke-Acts</u>'.[2] The understanding of it as apologetic in purpose is probably most dramatically and concisely put by the suggestion that it was, either together with or independently of the third gospel, a defence brief for Paul's assumed trial at Rome before Nero. This kind of approach arises from seeking an interpretation which accounts for the recurring topics of Christianity's innocence in terms of Roman law, and of some antipathy towards the Jews. Cadbury, for example, sees these themes as being sufficiently important to devote the greater part of his chapter 'The Object of Luke-Acts' to elucidating them.[3] F. F. Bruce, in his commentary on the English text, devotes the whole of that portion of his introduction entitled 'Origin and Purpose of Acts' to the

subject, understanding the book as written for the Roman middle classes at a time when Christianity had been brought to their notice.[4] J. C. O'Neill states: "It is the pervasive purpose of Luke-Acts to convert the educated reader who might pick up this book".[5] This is to say that Luke has an interest, even a primary interest, in the educated, who are inevitably the middle classes, people - as O'Neill says in connection with the Areopagus address - like Dionysius the Areopagite, and Damaris, and no doubt also sellers of that most valuable of commodities, purple cloth. Speaking of Luke's Gospel, Bultmann provides an interesting parallel opinion when he says, "What is peculiar to him is the apologetic tendency which appears in the Passion narrative", and a potential contrast when he speaks of him sharing with the tradition a sentimental interest in the poor, the despised, and women.[6]

The opposition to the view that Acts, or Luke-Acts, has an apologetic purpose is frequently argued from the point of view of the content of the work. No outsider or Roman official, it is claimed, would have been interested in the theological concerns and disputes reflected. Barrett, for example, objects, "No Roman official would ever have filtered out so much of what to him would be theological and ecclesiastical rubbish in order to reach so tiny a grain of relevant apology".[7]

Yet such judgment of interest in subject matter, especially if a wider non-Christian audience than the purely official is in view, is largely subjective and somewhat uncertain. There is no accounting for taste. An audience that retained an

interest in the foreign researches of Herodotus could well be imagined at least to survive, for example, the sermons of Peter and Stephen, since what these do is give a brief synopsis of the history which led up to the events about which the audience is now learning. And a taste for the recherché is not uncommon, nor was it in the Hellenistic audience to judge from the literature.

It is for such reason that assessment of the probable reaction of the ancient reader to the book will be attempted not only on the basis of a system of analysis which has previously been applied to the book only in an extremely limited way, but also on a relatively objective one. Interpretation will be essentially on the basis of form, of literary analysis, rather than on the basis of subject matter, grammar or syntax. For at no time have people unanimously refused to read books because of some alleged syntactical or grammatical infelicities, and what appears to the reader to be the dominant subject matter of the book may be considerably affected by the interpretative tools he instinctively brings to it out of his own background and interests. Hence the kind of analysis used in this thesis may well reveal that more of Acts has potential apologetic value than might previously have been generally supposed. To minimise the influence of modern presuppositions, analysis will proceed on the basis of trying to understand Acts in terms rather of the presuppositions which the ancient reader's education would have instilled into him.

Ancient education, both Greek and Roman, was initially

and principally directed towards skill in rhetoric. The teacher's approach was based on the assumption that there was a correct way of saying things. All writing was to some degree categorised, with a way of writing appropriate to each category. If a new piece of writing did not fall into a recognised category or its accepted canons, the overwhelming tendency would have been to dismiss it as bad writing rather than to acknowledge a weakness in the traditional system of construction and analysis.

At an early stage in his education, a Greek-speaking boy would have been taught how to write about certain things by being given examples from the great authors of the past and being required to imitate them. This had a twofold effect. First of all it produced a conservatism in literary practice. Works were indeed written according to the canons of the rhetoricians. Secondly, it produced a conservatism in literary taste. Whether or not a work had been written in accordance with these canons, it was read, understood and appreciated in terms of them. This is most obvious in the way in which the rhetoricians approached Homer, making the end product of oral tradition into a quarry for <u>exempla</u> of developed rhetorical practice.

The ancient reader, then, might from time to time have noticed, or imagined that he noticed, how practices that he had been taught at school were reflected in what he was reading. This could be in the most simple of ways. For example, in teaching the art of προσωποποιία Theon makes this remark in connection with the practice of

Herodotus:

> καὶ διὰ γένος ἕτεροι μὲν λόγοι τοῦ Λάκωνος παῦροι καὶ λιγέες, ἕτεροι δὲ τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ ἀνδρὸς στωμύλοι. καὶ βαρβαρικῶς φαμὲν εἰπεῖν πολλάκις τὸν Ἡρόδοτον καίπερ ἑλληνιστὶ γράφοντα, ὅτι τοὺς ἐκείνων λόγους μεμίμηται.
>
> (10.236/II.116.5-9)[8]

This practice of reflecting the language of the speaker in the form adopted in the Greek is observable in Acts. In his commentary Haenchen notes at Acts 15.14 that "Luke employs the form Συμεών to show that James, the Lord's brother, is speaking Aramaic". His note on Acts 26.14 reads, "τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ: that Jesus speaks Aramaic to Paul is indicated in 9.4 and 22.7 by the address Σαούλ, but here expressly noted". Nor is Aramaic the only foreign language noted. At Acts 14.11 Luke says that the people spoke Lycaonian. Although on this occasion no attempt is made to imitate the sound of the language, προσωποποιΐα may be pursued in the myth which is reflected in their reactions, for it would appear to be of Phrygian origin.[9]

That the injunctions of the school teacher should be so directly reflected in what purports to be a major piece of literature may seem strange to the modern man. He tends to see his education more as a matter of becoming mature enough to leave behind what he was taught as a juvenile. The ancient practice was rather to start with the simpler types of rhetorical genre and move on to the more complex, of which the simpler types might prove to be a part already learned. F. J. Cairns describes the position of the <u>progymnasmata</u> (school exercises) in rhetoric as follows:

> "Many ancient treatises on progymnasmata have survived. The reason why progymnasmata are classed as a distinct category of genres is historical, not logical. Some of the progymnasmata could, if one wished, be classified with a little thought under one or other of the major branches of rhetoric. The historical reason for not doing so but for regarding progymnasmata as a separate category of genres is that these school-exercises, which were used as preparatory work for schoolboys aspiring to be instructed in and to practise major branches of rhetoric, were assembled together for this purpose, and entered the consciousness of all later antiquity as a group. A subsidiary reason is that, because they were childhood exercises, they can be considered as the minimum formal rhetorical equipment of any literate person from the Hellenistic period on. Poetic examples of progymnasmata are not uncommon. Perhaps the best known is Propertius 2.12 (a kataskeue), where not only the rhetorical framework but also the particular subject-matter is known to correspond with that of a real-life Roman school-exercise (see Quintilian Institutio Oratoria 2.4.26). Another well-known poetic progymnasma is Juvenal 6, an inflated example of the thesis 'Ought a man to marry'."[10]

Cairns is not quite accurate in stating that Propertius 2.12 is a κατασκευή - argumentation in support of the proposition. As Camps notes in his commentary,[11] the poem falls into two halves. Lines one to twelve are indeed a κατασκευή, declaring how it is normally very appropriate for Cupid to be depicted as a winged boy. Lines thirteen to twenty-four are, however, founded on an ἀνασκευή, a rejection of the picture on the grounds that, as far as Propertius is concerned, Eros is by no means flighty enough. Cairns is correct, on the other hand, to introduce the term κατασκευή even although Quintilian chooses to introduce this subject for debate under the heading of thesis, and not directly in connection with the ἀνασκευή and

κατασκευή of a narratio, which for him includes fabula, and with which he has already dealt:

> "Narrationibus non inutiliter subiungitur opus destruendi confirmandique eas, quod ἀνασκευή et κατασκευή uocatur. Id porro non tantum in fabulosis et carmine traditis fieri potest, uerum etiam in ipsis annalium monumentis: ut, si quaeratur 'an sit credibile super caput Valeri pugnantis sedisse coruum, qui os oculosque hostis Galli rostro atque alis euerberaret,' sit in utramque partem ingens ad dicendum materia: aut de serpente, quo Scipio traditur genitus, et lupa Romuli et Egeria Numae; nam Graecis historiis plerumque poeticae similis licentia est."
> (Institutio Oratoria 2.4.18–19)

It may seem rather chauvinistic on Quintilian's part to say that Greek historiography was particularly prone to indulging poetic licence when we consider the rather fabulous examples which he has just cited from the Roman annals. What is more significant here, however, is that it is just this fabulous or mythical element in historical writing, as part of the general mythological inheritance, which is singled out to exemplify the best subject matter for the exercise of ἀνασκευή and κατασκευή.

In view of this educational background, the reader might well have seen Acts 14.8–19 as reflecting this exercise. Translating the debate out of the dramatic form in which it is to be found in Acts and into a more conventional discussion, the subject would be said to be, "That these men are gods". Verses 8–13 then give points of the κατασκευή. Firstly, a miracle has occurred, and through their agency. Secondly, the one must be Hermes because he does the speaking and the other must be Zeus – the third argument – because the priest of Zeus desires to offer sacrifice. The convenient timing

of the priest's appearance should perhaps be viewed as an omen, rather than as a deliberate decision on his part to offer sacrifice to these two men. It is the crowd (v.18) not the priest (v.13) whom Luke credits with the desire to sacrifice to Barnabas and Paul in particular. It may also be noted in passing that the argument has a rhetorically chiastic shape rather than a direct dramatic shape of the type, "This one is Hermes because he does all the talking. And here comes the priest of Zeus, so the other must be Zeus!"

Verses 14–19 now give the points of the ἀναδκευή. The thesis propounded in verse 11, "οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες ἀνθρώποις κατέβησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς" is rejected in a phrase reminiscent of it in sound, "καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἐσμεν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωποι". "θεοί" and "ἄνθρωποι" are in equally emphatic but contrasting positions. The actual points of the counter argument are, firstly, that if they were these gods they would not be preaching another God. Secondly, sacrifice was not in fact offered to them. Thirdly, and this may pick up the word ὁμοιοπαθεῖς, immortal gods are not stoned till they are at death's door.

Such an understanding of Acts 14.8–19 reveals in it a simple but finely balanced structure. Taking the appearance of the priest as part of the speech of the crowd as indirectly reported, there is (a) an action of Paul taken as part proof of (b) the thesis and κατασκευή or <u>suasoria</u> of the crowd. This is followed by (c) the ἀνασκευή or <u>controuersia</u> of Barnabas and Paul, which is confirmed by (d) the action of

the crowd in stoning Paul. An elegant chiasmus.

The κατασκευή may have been seen as influencing another passage in Acts. The thesis "μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων" (19.28,34) is ἀναντιρρήτον, proved by supernatural portent, a mythical truth which everyone knows. Perhaps, then, the reader is entitled to be a little amused at the expense of those who are reported to have spent two hours loudly repeating the point. Those, however, who seek more than entertainment to persuade them would be well advised to forego the amusement, and linger a little longer in Lystra in order to observe how the description of the lame man, because it is used as part of the κατασκευή, takes on the insistently repetitive form which Haenchen notes.[12] What matters to the argument is emphasised and re-emphasised, and nothing irrelevant, not even his name, is mentioned.

It is only by accumulation of such detailed rhetorical analysis of passages in Acts as has now been completed for the Lystra episode that confidence can be built up that the ancient reader, nurtured as he was on a rhetorical education, could have found Acts understandable. If such analysis can be executed sufficiently often, it will become more probable that this kind of structuring and patterning is, as in the case of Propertius, art based on education rather than mere coincidence. For this accumulation is also the sole means by which it is possible to enter upon the hazardous judgment that not only has a distant intellectual climate been entered, but also that something of the movements of a

particular mind within that climate has been discerned. If it is accepted that that case has been made, then the above analysis of Acts 14.8-19 will be taken to have shown how a section which Haenchen regards as a likely area for the presence of literary embellishment[13] would have been elaborated in terms of method, rather than in terms of speculation about sources of material.

Sufficient explanation of the method of interpretation to be employed in this thesis has now been given by the simple expedient of practical example. It is opportune to set out the procedure more systematically. Two superficially contrasting principles will be followed.

The first element in the procedure is to refer to the theoretical understanding of the rhetorical genre under consideration by turning to one of the surviving rhetorical handbooks. Many such handbooks survive. The central reason for strictly limiting the number referred to is that the average ancient reader would not have been acquainted with every possible facet of interpretation of rhetorical theory by the various schools, but would have drunk principally at one fountain. It is, therefore, good to approach Acts from a broadly similar background. For if analysis can be made largely on the basis of one teacher's theory, then it is more likely that an ancient reader would have responded similarly, than if every possible book of theory has to be ransacked in order to make the analysis.

Theory divided the rhetorical genres into four groups, the προγυμνάσματα, and the epideictic, dicanic and

symbouleutic genres. For theoretical description of the first of these groups, use will be made of the 'Προγυμνάσματα' of Aelius Theon, as already in the case of ἀναδκευή and Καταδκευή. His work has been chosen because it is the earliest of such collections extant. As a writer of the second century, and given the enormous traditionalism of rhetorical theory, he may readily be taken to represent the teaching of Luke's contemporaries, assuming that Acts was written say in the last two decades of the first century. Quintilian, who has already been quoted, would have been an earlier source, but his is not a straightforward exposition of the Greek system and hence he would not be as valuable a central source of theory.

For theory relating to the epideictic genres use will be made of the third century treatise 'Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν', the first of the two so named to come down under the name of Menander of Laodicea. There is no other surviving work which covers the area, and so the modern student must content himself in the knowledge that the basic principles did not change throughout antiquity, and that the third century Greek mind was very much more closely attuned to the first century Greek mind than is the mind of late twentieth century western European man.

In the case of the dicanic or forensic genres, works easily predating Luke are readily available. Use will principally be made of the Rhetorica ad Herennium, and some corroborating reference will be made to Cicero's De Inuentione. These works are closely related, and both belong to the earlier

part of the first century before Christ. The Rhetorica ad Herennium represents the fully developed Greek rhetorical theory.[14] The De Inuentione is an early work which is largely traditional in content, and which contains little of the more personal opinions of some of Cicero's later writings on rhetoric. Although these predate Luke by about a century and a half, there is no fear of their views having become outmoded, for the general practice was to expand upon rather than to reject what had gone before.

In the case of symbouleutic or deliberative oratory allusion will be made to Aristotle's Rhetoric. Some reference will also be made to it at other times, since the work of Aristotle was one of the main foundations of all subsequent theory.

The second element in the analytical procedure to be used in this thesis is that of exemplification from and comparison with passages from other works of literature. The principle followed in this stands in some contrast with that followed in the case of the works of theory. The influence of rhetorical theory, and the opportunity for rhetorical analysis, will be illustrated from a deliberately wide range of literature. The wider the range of literature which it can be shown the Hellenistic man both wrote and read in the light of this cast of mind, the more certain it is that, if he picked up Acts, he would automatically have interpreted it out of such presuppositions, to whichever precise genre of literature he took it to belong (a point which, incidentally, makes

it unnecessary to discuss here the literary genre of Acts). Nevertheless, even with this broad interest, particular attention will be paid to historiographers and to works from approximately the mid-first to the mid-second century A.D.

The case of Homer deserves special comment. The Iliad and the Odyssey were the standard school textbooks. They were also regarded in some sense as the repository of all wisdom, so that it was not only rhetoric that Homer was considered to teach. Hence, if any practice can be paralleled from Homer, that is a matter of no little significance - to use a favourite figure of Luke's.

Since it would be well beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt a complete rhetorical analysis of Acts, the next aspect of the procedure to be followed that requires discussion is the selection of a single elementary rhetorical form as the central tool of interpretation. The form chosen is the exercise in ἔκφρασις, and more particularly in ἔκφρασις προσώπου, the description of a person. It has not been singled out arbitrarily. Because it was one which a boy practised quite early in his school career, it was a tool which every reader with any education would have used. There is, however, an even more important reason for regarding it as of central significance.

Theon remarks that ἔκφρασις is especially common in the historians.[15] It is an injunction of Lucian that in writing history one should concentrate on the principal figures in an action.[16] Together these points reflect the

fact that what is central to ancient historical writing in general is, as P. G. Walsh points out, "the individual - his thoughts, his emotions, his words, his acts, his character; these are the stuff of history, the motivators of events".[17] Cadbury puts it:

> "If one thinks of Hebrew history on the one hand, or Greek history on the other one recalls the strong bias toward dealing with individuals. Group movements and cultural, economic and social developments are more difficult of description and more modern. As in Luke-Acts, the narratives of ancient history were often carried forward by the careers of successive individuals".[18]

The point is well illustrated from Tacitus, whose historical writing is basically an account of the careers of successive emperors. Syme says that, like Hellenistic historians, Sallust puts personality at the centre of events.[19] Livy's concentration on the individual may be highlighted by the way in which he makes Hannibal more or less equal Carthage for the duration of his account of the Second Punic War, and Walsh points out that the later pentads of the Ab Urbe Condita are built, not around campaigns, but around the dominant Roman of the day.[20] The monumental significance which Thucydides attributes to one person, Pericles, is made clear in the way in which he disrupts his basically annalistic framework in order to write his obituary.[21]

The theory behind this mode of interpretation of the past, that a man's destiny and so ultimately all human destiny is determined by individual character, is expressed in colloquial fashion by the dramatist Menander:

"(Onesimus) οὐκ ἄρα φροντίζουσιν ἡμῶν οἱ θεοί;
φήσεις. ἑκάστῳ τὸν τρόπον συν[ῴκισαν
φρούραρχον· οὗτος ἔνδο[ν] ἐπ[ιτεταγμένος
ἐπέτριψεν; ἂν αὐτῷ κακῶς χρη[σώμεθα,
ἕτερον δ' ἔδωσεν. οὗτός ἐσθ' ἡμῖν θεὸς,
ὅ τ' αἴτιος καὶ τοῦ καλῶς καὶ τοῦ κακῶς
πράττειν ἑκάστῳ· τοῦτον ἱλάσκου ποῶν
μηδὲν ἄτοπον μηδ' ἀμαθές, ἵνα πράττῃς καλῶς.
(Smicrines) εἶθ' οὑμός, ἱερόσυλε, νῦν τρόπος ποεῖ
ἀμαθές τι;
(Onesimus) συντρίβει σε.
(Smicrines) τῆς παρρησίας.

(Epitrepontes 1092(734) - 1101(743))

Luke's near contemporary, Seneca, also sees a man's character as a controlling spirit:

> "sacer intra nos spiritus sedet, malorum bonorumque nostrorum obseruator et custos. hic prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat".
> (Epistulae Morales xli.2)

Or again, recourse may be had to the opinion which Cicero offers in the De Oratore (II.63) that events are caused by chance, wisdom, or rashness, that human qualities and divine intervention are all that is needed to explain the past, and hence leaders alone are important in history, and an account of their careers and characters should be given.

Enough has been said in preliminary justification of the choice of the character sketch as the central tool of interpretation. The ultimate justification will come as the effectiveness of the choice unfolds. Rhetorical analysis of character sketches is, however, not sufficient in itself. Hence the fourth element in the method to be followed.

The fourth and final aspect of the procedure is the setting of the character sketches in the context of the larger rhetorical structures within which they may occur.

These larger structures illuminate and determine the function, purpose, and meaning of lesser structures or forms within them. Thus, for example, the lack of interest in anything other than the man lame in Lystra's lameness was illuminated by the exposure of his case as a mere datum in an argument, a κατασκευή, with which Luke himself does not even agree. The treatment of him accords with the fact that he is scarcely an actor in Luke's drama.

From this discussion of the procedure to be followed it will have become clear that, although the interpretation is in terms of rhetorical theory and practice, the thesis is not essentially about the much discussed speeches in Acts. Some of them, especially from the latter part of the book, will have to be considered as the setting of ἔκφρασις προσώπου. Paul's speech in Athens, on the other hand, which might have seemed an obvious candidate for inclusion in a discussion of the significance of Acts to the educated, Greek-speaking non-churchman, will not be analysed in detail because it does not relate to any specific character description.

Since chapter four is about digressions in Acts, it might have been supposed that herein lay another reason for including a discussion of the scene in Athens. The view has been taken that the visit to Athens was a digression from Paul's own travel plans, and also that the speech is a digression from the way in which the historical Paul preached.[22] Both these points may be

perfectly correct, but the ancient reader would not have known and, in all probability, would not have been greatly concerned. Because the thesis is concerned with what such a reader would have made of the text before him, and not with judgments dependent on specific historical information from outwith the work, the emphasis is on literary and not historical judgments. Even if the story of the visit to Athens is a digression in some historical sense, it is not a literary digression, and it is literary digressions that will be discussed in detail later. The Athens scene will only be alluded to in a general way once a pattern of understanding has already been established.[23]

Another topic that might have been expected to arise in a discussion of figures appearing in Acts falls out for similar reason. This is the case of the circumcision of Timothy (16.1-3), and a comparison of it with the case of Titus in Paul's letter to the Galatians (2.1-5). If, as Haenchen says,[24] Luke knew nothing of the uncircumcised Titus, how much less likely that the general reader would have known. Thus the famous textual crux in Galatians is of no concern here, for the information about Timothy can be accepted as presented, even as the ancient reader would have accepted it.

None of this is intended to imply that the literary analyses which will be made in the thesis have no bearing upon historical problems. On the whole it makes judgment about the relative historical value of various episodes more difficult, for if the analysis does reveal the way in

which Luke thought and worked, it tends to reinforce the view that he had near total mastery over his material. The result of this is that, where there is no other source for the subject matter of which he is treating, it is well nigh impossible to get behind what he says. Further, the teaching of the rhetoricians was in important part the stylisation of situations in life and of perfectly natural behaviour. Once, however, the grip of rhetorical education was established, it would reflect back on life and on the situations from which it was derived, reinforcing the patterning of them. People with even a modest education would tend to do things as they were trained to believe that they should be done. Hence, if a sequence of events follows a recognisable rhetorical pattern, a variety of explanations is possible. Firstly, because the actors in the history acted within the same conventions as the rhetoricians, the pattern may arise because things happened that way, and Luke wrote them up on the basis of the evidence. Secondly, it may be that, because of the presuppositions of his education, Luke selected from the evidence available to him in such a way as to bring out the 'correct' pattern. Thirdly, it could be that in a given instance Luke had next to no evidence, but simply used his rhetorical education in order to deduce that it must have happened that way (for there is no doubt that historiographers in general did write on that basis from time to time). Fourthly, it is quite possible that Luke, although elaborating on extremely scanty evidence, still presents a broadly accurate picture because he operated

within the same social conventions as the people about whom he was writing. In other words, he was in some ways far better placed to make constructions upon such evidence as there was than the modern interpreter would be. This enumeration of possibilities shows quite clearly how the recognition of rhetorical influences complicates historical judgment. Yet, for all the relevance of classical rhetorical analysis to modern historical judgment, such judgment is beyond the scope of this thesis.

One other aspect of the scope of the discussion merits comment. Apart from a number of asides which refer to Luke's Gospel, analysis is restricted to passages from the Acts of the Apostles. The generally held opinion that Luke and Acts are two books of a single work by the same author might seem to indicate that correct interpretation is not possible unless both works are handled simultaneously. This seems more obvious if an assessment is being attempted essentially on the basis of consideration of subject matter. There is something questionable, particularly in terms of the possibility of inappropriate presuppositions, about claiming that the topics of one book would have interested a certain audience, while those of the other would not. Since, however, some doubt has already been cast on the reliability of such a mode of procedure, and since the method of interpretation to be followed here is based on form and not on subject, the situation is rather different. For, if the rhetorical analyses of the passages from Acts hold true, the understanding which these analyses suggest holds as well. This remains so whether Luke and Acts are treated separately

or together. Thus, while the application to Luke of the procedure followed here for Acts may indeed be a worthy subject for investigation, the absence from the thesis of a full discussion of the third gospel in no way invalidates the ensuing discussion of Acts. Rather, were it to transpire that the gospel was not susceptible to these same analytical procedures, that would more tend to raise questions about the authorship of, or the relative dating of, or the influence of sources in, or the full identity or catholicity of taste of the intended audience for the two books, than to undermine the appropriateness of the procedure. This is because essentially the only assumption behind this method of analysis is that Acts was written within the context of the Romano-Hellenistic world, and that is scarcely an assumption at all. Almost everything else about either Luke's gospel or Acts is more uncertain than that.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), pp. 14-50, 116-132.

2. Robert Maddox, The Purpose of Luke-Acts, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982), pp. 19-23.

3. H.J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, (New York: Macmillan, 1958, as reprinted London: S.P.C.K., 1968), pp. 306-16.

4. F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts: the English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1972), pp. 17-24.

5. J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), pp. 170-1.

6. Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972), p. 367.

7. C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, (London: Epworth, 1961), p. 63.

8. Theon is cited throughout from L. Spengel, Rhetores Graeci, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1854), first by the conventional system of reference and then, for convenience, by volume, page, and line in Spengel.

9. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 433.

10. Francis Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry, (Edinburgh: University Press, 1972), p. 75.

11. Propertius, Elegies Book II, ed. W. A. Camps, (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), p. 112.

12. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 425.

13. Ibid., pp. 88, 430-4.

14. See G. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p. 12.

15. I.148/II.60.

16. Lucian, 59 (πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν), 49

17. P.G. Walsh, Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods (Cambridge University Press, 1961), p. 34.

18. Cadbury, op. cit., pp. 132-3.

19. R. Syme, Sallust, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press/London: Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 51.

20. Walsh, op. cit., p. 7.

21. Thucydides II.65.

22. Cf. e.g. Günther Bornkamm, Paul, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), pp. 52, 65-7.

23. See Ch. VIII below.

24. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 480.

II

"That's my last Duchess painted on the wall,
Looking as if she were alive. I call
That piece a wonder, now: Fra Pandolf's hands
Worked busily a day, and there she stands".

Robert Browning

CHAPTER II

THE FORM AND CONTENT OF THE ΕΚΦΡΑΣΙΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΥ

In the introduction to his commentary on Luke's Gospel, Plummer remarks that "the sixth century was not far from the truth when it called him a painter, and said that he had painted the portrait of the Virgin. There is no picture of her so complete as his. How lifelike are his sketches of Zacharias, Anna, Zacchaeus, Herod Antipas! And with how few touches is each done!"[1] It is particularly appropriate that he should approve the tradition of Luke as a painter by pointing to some of the character sketches in the Gospel, for there was in fact an interaction between literary sketches and ancient portraiture.[2] Indeed, he might have mentioned other fine examples from Luke's Gospel, including those of Simeon (2.25-26) and Joseph of Arimathaea (23.50-51). The purpose of this chapter is to identify similar descriptions in Acts, and to consider their form and content in comparison with character sketches in ancient literature generally.

A. The Form

> "He came from the north. He lived a brief passionate unhappy life. He wrote magnificent poetry. And he introduced a new word for 'kiss' into the European languages. Although he was a superb poet, only one solitary copy of his poems survived the dark ages - a single battered manuscript, preserved in his home, Verona. Yet even if that lonely copy had perished and all his poems had been lost, one of his creations would have remained. Whenever a Frenchman says <u>baiser</u>, whenever an Italian speaks of <u>un bacio</u>, when a Spaniard says <u>besar</u> or a Portuguese <u>beijor</u> they are using the word which this poet picked up and made into Latin to

> amuse his sweetheart. The woman was unworthy. The poet died. The word lives.
>
> "His name was Catullus. Apart from his poignant and violent poems, we know very little about him. Even in ancient times, he was not universally studied and revered as a 'classic'."[3]

This passage from the beginning of Gilbert Highet's portrait of the Roman poet Catullus conveys as well as any piece of English could the stylistic atmosphere of the ἔκφρασις προσώπου. What it is in the handling of the ancient languages that produces this atmosphere must now be analysed.

Firstly it is not dependent on length, since the length of an ἔκφρασις προσώπου is highly variable. The Homeric description of Thersites is short:

> "Θερσίτης δ' ἔτι μοῦνος ἀμετροεπὴς ἐκολώα,
> ὃς ῥ' ἔπεα φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἀκοσμά τε πολλά τε ἤδη,
> μάψ, ἀτὰρ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, ἐριζέμεναι βασιλεῦσιν,
> ἀλλ' ὅ τι οἱ εἴσαιτο γελοίϊον Ἀργείοισιν
> ἔμμεναι· αἴσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε·
> φολκὸς ἦν, χωλὸς δ' ἕτερον πόδα· τὼ δέ οἱ ὤμω
> κυρτώ, ἐπὶ στῆθος συνοχωκότε· αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε
> φοξὸς ἦν κεφαλήν, ψεδνὴ δ' ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη.
> ἔχθιστος δ' Ἀχιλῆϊ μάλιστ' ἦν ἠδ' Ὀδυσῆϊ·
> τὼ γὰρ νεικείεσκε ...."
>
> (Iliad II.212-221)

This example is partially quoted by Theon in his prescription for ἔκφρασις. He also alludes to another fairly short example, that of Herodotus' description of the hippopotamus:

> "οἱ δὲ ἵπποι οἱ ποτάμιοι νομῷ μὲν τῷ Παπρημίτῃ ἱροί εἰσι, τοῖσι δὲ ἄλλοισι Αἰγυπτίοισι οὐκ ἱροί. φύσιν δὲ παρέχονται ἰδέης τοιήνδε· τετράπουν ἐστί, δίχηλον, ὁπλὰς βοός, σιμόν, λοφιὴν ἔχον ἵππου, χαυλιόδοντας φαῦνον, οὐρὴν ἵππου καὶ φωνήν, μέγαθος ὅσον τε βοῦς ὁ μέγιστος. τὸ δέρμα δ' αὐτοῦ οὕτω δή τι παχύ ἐστι ὥστε αὖον γενομένου ξυστὰ ποιέεσθαι [ἀκόντια] ἐξ αὐτοῦ."
>
> (II.71)

The rhetoricians' tilling of this field naturally produced much larger growths. Hence one can find in both Sallust

and his imitator Livy highly developed examples which are much too long to quote here. One need only mention Sallust's portrait of Catiline (Catilina v.1-8) and Livy's of Hannibal (Ab Urbe Condita XXI.4).

Certain stylistic features, however, can be identified as belonging to this school exercise and to the literary reflections of it. As each is discussed, wherever it is at all practicable, an exhaustive list of the examples in Acts will be offered. In this way, during the course of the discussion, all the character sketches in the book will effectively be identified.

(1) Asyndeton

The first thing to notice is the use of asyndeton. Aristotle opines that it gives the impression that much information is being conveyed:

"ἔτι ἔχει ἴδιόν τι τὰ ἀσύνδετα· ἐν ἴσῳ γὰρ χρόνῳ πολλὰ δοκεῖ εἰρῆσθαι· ὁ γὰρ σύνδεσμος ἓν ποιεῖ τὰ πολλά, ὥστ' ἐὰν ἐξαιρεθῇ, δῆλον ὅτι τοὐναντίον ἔσται τὸ ἕν πολλά. ἔχει οὖν αὔξησιν· 'ἦλθον, διελέχθην, ἱκέτευσα,' πολλὰ δοκεῖ ὑπερισδεῖν ὅσα εἶπεν."

(Rhetoric III.1413b/xii.4)

In going on to illustrate this principle from literature, he alludes to Homer's description of Nireus which is part of the catalogue of the Greek forces:

"Νιρεὺς αὖ Σύμηθεν ἄγε τρεῖς νῆας ἐΐσας,
Νιρεὺς Ἀγλαΐης υἱὸς Χαρόποιό τ' ἄνακτος,
Νιρεύς, ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα·
ἀλλ' ἀλαπαδνὸς ἔην, παῦρος δέ οἱ εἵπετο λαός."

(Iliad II.671-675)

Hence it is clear that asyndeton is well suited to the thumb-nail sketch. It may be noted in the various examples mentioned above. Elsewhere in Homer its use may be observed in incipient

form at the beginning of his description of Nestor, "τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ/ ἡδυεπὴς ἀνόρουσε, λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής/ . . . ." (Iliad I.247-8).

A few examples from Acts of brief sketches entirely in the asyndetic style may be offered.

"ἀναστὰς δέ τις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Φαρισαῖος, ὀνόματι Γαμαλίηλ, νομοδιδάσκαλος, τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ,...." (5.34)

"Γάϊον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον, Μακεδόνας, συνεκδήμους Παύλου." (19.29)

"Μνάσωνί τινι, Κυπρίῳ, ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ." (21.16)

"ἑκατοντάρχῃ, ὀνόματι Ἰουλίῳ, σπείρης Σεβαστῆς." (27.1)

As is to be expected, the asyndetic pattern is not maintained throughout longer sketches. That would be too wearing. The fairly short sketch of Eleazar in Maccabees IV.5.4 affords a neat example of this drift away from the use of asyndeton:

"εἷς, πρῶτος ἐκ τῆς ἀγέλης, ὀνόματι Ἐλεαζαρος, τὸ γένος ἱερεύς, τὴν ἐπιστήμην νομικός, καὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν προήκων. καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν περὶ τὸν τύραννον διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν γνώριμος ...."

The following examples from Acts are illustrative of those which are long enough to depart from a purely asyndetic structure and to begin to make use of the conjunction 'καί'.

"ἀνὴρ δέ τις ἐν Καισαρείᾳ, ὀνόματι Κορνήλιος, ἑκατοντάρχης, ἐκ σπείρης τῆς καλουμένης Ἰταλικῆς, εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνας πολλὰς τῷ λαῷ καὶ δεόμενος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ παντός ...." (10.1-2)

"Κορνήλιος, ἑκατοντάρχης, ἀνὴρ δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ..."

(10.22)

(2) Participial Phrases

After asyndeton, the second stylistic feature to notice is the use of the participial phrase, the present participle often being used. This usage is stylistically more striking in Latin than in Greek, where the poetic atmosphere it creates may indeed reflect the Greek origins of the rhetoric being employed:

". . . . corpus patiens inediae algoris uigiliae . . . . alieni adpetens . . . . ardens in cupiditatibus".
(Sallust, Cat. V)

Many examples of the use of the participial phrase in the context of the ἔκφρασις προσώπου may be noted in Acts: "χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων" (3.2); "καλουμένου Σαύλου" (7.58); "μαγεύων καὶ ἐξιστάνων τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν" (8.9); "ἐξ ἐτῶν ἀκτὼ κατακείμενον ἐπὶ κραβάτου" (9.33); "φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνας πολλὰς τῷ λαῷ, καὶ δεόμενος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ παντός" (10.2); "φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων" (10.22); "σεβομένη τὸν θεόν" (16.14); "ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα" (16.16); "προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας" (18.2); "σεβομένου τὸν θεόν" (18.7); "δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς" (18.24); "ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος" (19.24); "ὄντες αὐτῷ φίλοι" (19.31); "ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά" (21.8); "προφητεύουσαι" (21.9); "γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιὴλ πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου, ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τοῦ

θεοῦ καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε σήμερον" (22.3); "μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ παντῶν τῶν κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων" (22.12); "οὔσῃ Ἰουδαίᾳ" (24.24); "παρακεχειμακότι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ" (28.11).

Such phrases are a very natural part of Greek style. Their value to an author in this kind of context is that the participle may readily be understood as a substantive or as an adjective, and thus sit comfortably in an asyndetic, descriptive list. At the same time, the verbal affinity of participles means that the writer can deploy them in such a way that the movement from description back into narrative takes place without a break.

Smooth transitions were valued in ancient rhetoric. Lucian, in writing "πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν", complains of, "τὸ ἀσύμφυλον καὶ ἀνάρμοστον καὶ δυσκόλλητον" (11) while reviewing the faults he finds in some historiographers. He advocates a "εὐαφής τε καὶ εὐάγωγος μετάβασις" (55) from preface to narrative,[4] and says that the narrative itself should be smooth and the matter interwoven (συμπεριπλοκή), that one should avoid breaks and a multiplicity of disjointed narratives, and that neighbouring topics should overlap and have matter in common.[5] As this study proceeds it will be observed in just how many instances Luke achieves this kind of aesthetic effect, it being impossible in many cases to assert that this or that section begins or ends with this or that verse or phrase.

(3) Relative Pronouns

After the use of asyndeton and the participle, the third feature to note is that the writer frequently turns to the use

of the relative pronoun. Again he could point to Homer for precedent in the use of such clauses. He might refer to the description of Nireus which was quoted above,[6] and that of Calchas begins:

> "Κάλχας Θεστορίδης, οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος,
> ὃς ἤδη τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα..."
> (Iliad, I.69-70)

Such a simple usage barely required illustration. One example from Sallust will suffice:

> "Cn. Piso, adulescens nobilis, summae audaciae, egens, factiosus, quem ad perturbandam rem publicam inopia atque mali mores stimulabant."
> (Cat. xviii.4)

Many such relative clauses are used in the course of ἐκφράσεις προσώπου in Acts: "ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος" (1.23); "ὃν ἐτίθουν καθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ" (3.2); "ᾧ προσεῖχον πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου" (8.10); "ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς, [ὃς] ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ" (8.27); "ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος" (9.33); "ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος" (10.5); "ᾧ ἐστιν οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν" (10.6); "ᾧ ὄνομα Βαριησοῦς, ὃς ἦν σὺν τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ" (13.6-7); "ὃς οὐδέποτε περιεπάτησεν" (14.8); "ᾧ ἐμαρτυρεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Λύστροις καὶ Ἰκονίῳ ἀδελφῶν" (16.2); "ἥτις ἐστιν πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις" (16.12); "ἧς ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν" (16.14); "ἥτις ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρεῖχεν τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντευομένη" (16.16); "οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ" (18.7); "ὃς ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτου" (22.4); "ὃν σὺ διώκεις" (22.8).

The use of these clauses again provides an excellent basis from which to slip unobtrusively back into the narrative, for example by making the relative pronoun the subject or

object of the next sentence: "ὃς ἀναδεξάμενος ἡμᾶς ἡμέρας τρεῖς φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισεν" (28.7). The clauses beginning, "ὡς ἰδὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην . . . . " (3.3), "οὓς ἔστησαν . . . . " (6.6), and "οἵτινες ἐλθόντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἐλάλουν . . . . " (11.20) similarly stand on the bridge between description and narrative.

(4) Demonstrative Pronouns

Just as a clause introduced by a relative pronoun can be a useful means of transition, so too can one introduced by a demonstrative pronoun. After the description of Gnaeus Piso quoted above, Sallust resumes his narrative with, "cum hoc Catilina et Autronius . . .". In the Jugurtha, after describing Gauda, he resumes his narrative with, "hunc Marius anxium adgreditur atque hortatur . . . " (lxv). Thus, in commenting on the phrase, "Caeso erat Quinctius," in Livy, Ab Urbe Condita III.xi.6, Ogilvie says:

> "To introduce a new character by the formula erat X, follow it by a thumb-nail sketch of his character, and resume the narrative with hic or is is an established technique of Hellenistic writing when an important new episode is commenced".[7]

In Acts, after listing the Apostles, Luke resumes, "οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν . . . . " (1.14). Having described the man lame in Lystra, he continues, "οὗτος ἤκουεν. . . . " (14.9). At 10.5 and 25.9 the demonstrative pronoun is used to make the transition from one description to another.

It may, of course, also be used in continuing a description, especially where it begins to take a more narrative form. An example of this is found in Hecataeus' description of Mosollamus the Jew, which is quoted by

Josephus (Contra Apionem 201-2). Another is in Lucian's "ψευδολογίστης ἢ περὶ τῆς ἀποφράδος":

> "....Ἀρχίλοχον, Πάριον τὸ γένος, ἄνδρα κομιδῇ ἐλεύθερον καὶ παρρησίαν συνόντα, μηδὲν οἰκνοῦντα ἀνειδίξειν, εἰ καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα λυπήσειν ἔμελλε τοὺς περιπετεῖς ἐσομένους τῇ χολῇ τῶν ἰάμβων αὐτοῦ. ἐκεῖνος τοίνυν πρός τινος τῶν τοιούτων ἀικούσας κακῶς τεττίγα ἔφη τὸν ἄνδρα εἰληφέναι τοῦ πτεροῦ, εἰκάζων ἑαυτὸν τῷ τεττίγι. ὁ Ἀρχίλοχος φύσει μὲν λάλῳ ὄντι καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς ἀνάγκης ὁπόταν δὲ καὶ τοῦ πτεροῦ ληφθῇ γεγωνότερον βοῶντι. 'καὶ σὺ δή,' ἔφη, 'ὦ κακοδαιμον ἄνθρωπε, τί βουλόμενος παιητὴν λάλον παροξύνεις ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν αὐτίως ζητοῦντα καὶ ὑποθέσεις τοῖς ἰάμβοις;'"
>
> (51.1)

There are a couple of clear examples of this use of the demonstrative in the middle of a description in Acts:

> "ἐν Ἰόππῃ δέ τις ἦν μαθήτρια, ὀνόματι Ταβιθά, ἣ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς· αὕτη ἦν πλήρης ἔργων ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἐλεημοσυνῶν ὧν ἐποίει."
>
> (9.36)

> "Ἰουδαῖος δέ τις Ἀπολλῶς ὀνόματι, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, κατήντησεν εἰς Ἔφεσον, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου· οὗτός τε ἤρξατο παρρησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ...."
>
> (18.24-6)

Finally, in the light of the two usages just described, it is not surprising to find that there are examples at Acts 13.7, 15.3, and 16.17 where decisiveness as to whether the clause introduced by the relative pronoun is primarily descriptive or narrative in function would be vain.

(5) Contrast

It is remarkable how often the four features of the style of the ἔκφρασις προσώπου which have been discussed so far - the use of asyndeton, of the participle, of the

relative and demonstrative pronouns - tend, in an extended description, to appear in approximately that order. In a brief description, of course, not all of them will appear. The fifth stylistic feature is rooted in a habit of thought which may pervade the whole description. The ancient rhetoricians were fond of proceeding by contrasts, whether real or artificial. Some may have been noticed in the descriptions already quoted in this chapter. In Herodotus' description of the hippopotamus it is present in the consideration of its sacredness. In the portrait of Archilochus a contrast is devised between the cicada uncaptured and captured. The practice is so common in oratory that it will suffice to add here only one more example, Sallust's portrait of Sulla:

> "Sulla gentis patriciae nobilis fuit, familia prope iam extincta maiorum ignavia, litteris Graecis atque Latinis iuxta atque doctissume eruditus, animo ingenti, cupidus uoluptatum, sed gloriae cupidior; otio luxurioso esse, tamen ab negotiis numquam uoluptas remorata, nisi quod de uxore potuit honestius consuli; facundus, callidus et amicitia facilis, ad similanda negotia altitudo ingeni incredibilis, multarum rerum ac maxume pecuniae largitor. atque illi felicissumo omnium ante ciuilem uictoriam numquam super industriam fortuna fuit, multique dubitauere, fortior an felicior esset. nam postea quae fecerit, incertum habeo pudeat an pigeat magis disserere. . ." (Jug. xcv.3-4)

The use of contrast in the ἔκφρασεις προσώπου in Acts is not particularly pronounced. Perhaps the most obvious example is in the sketch of Timothy: "υἱὸς γυναικὸς Ἰουδαίας πιστῆς, πατρὸς δὲ Ἕλληνος . . . . " (16.1). Contrasting parentage is part of Sallust's portrait of Dabar: "Dabar, Massugradae filius, ex gente Masinissae,

ceterum materno genere impar - nam pater eius ex concubina ortus erat - . . . . " (Jug. cviii.1).[8] A second example of contrast is to be found in Acts in the description of Apollos (quoted in section 4 above). His having been instructed in the way and teaching accurately about Jesus are set over against his knowing only the baptism of John. A third example is in Paul's description of himself. In this case the contrast is heightened by the use of isocolon, there being thirteen syllables in each phrase: "γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ" (22.3).

In Acts descriptive phrases are in fact as likely to be in parallel as to be contrasting. Paul continues his description of himself in two closely related and complimentary phrases: " παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιὴλ πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου, ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τοῦ θεοῦ καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε σήμερον". In the portrait of Apollos the phrases, "ἀνὴρ λόγιος, ... δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς", are not necessarily about contrasting Greek and Jewish aspects of his education. The description of the man lame from birth is decidedly repetitious.[9] The most noticeable example of ostensible balance comes, however, in the description of Cornelius where the two parts of the first phrase both find a response in the second: "εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνας πολλὰς τῷ λαῷ καὶ δεόμενος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ παντός" (10.2). Although it must be conceded that in the case of Acts the writer may have been influenced as much by the LXX as by rhetorical theory,

balance and the ability to say much the same thing in more than one way are part of the skill of rhetoric in any age. The ancient reader would have appreciated them as such.

(6) Formal reflection of the subject matter

As with contrast, the reflection of the subject matter in the form of the writing may occur at any stage in a character sketch. Theon prescribes it for ἔκφρασις:

> "ἄρεται δὲ ἐκφράσεως αἵδε, σαφήνεια μὲν μάλιστα καὶ ἐνάργεια τοῦ σχεδὸν ὁρᾶσθαι τὰ ἀπαγγελλομένα, ἔπειτα τὸ μὴ τελέως ἀπομηκύνειν περὶ τὰ ἄχρηστα, τὸ δὲ ὅλον συνεξομοιοῦσθαι χρὴ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν, ὥστε εἰ μὲν εὐανθές τι εἴη τὸ δηλούμενον, εὐανθῆ καὶ τὴν φράσιν εἶναι· εἰ δὲ αὐχμηρὸν ἢ φοβερὸν ἢ ὁποῖόν δή ποτε, μηδὲ τὰ τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἀπᾴδειν τῆς φύσεως αὐτῶν."
>
> (II.242/II.119.27-120.2)

At a general level, such mimetic writing is perhaps at its most famous in rhythmic terms in Homer's description of Sisyphus' rock: "αὖτις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδής" (Odyssey XI.598). Wilkinson remarks that, "the effect is due to the dactylic metre (rocks rolling down an uneven incline strike heavily less often than lightly, and this is stylised into dactyls, as in our onomatopoeic word 'bumpity') but also to the sharp thud of the dentals . . . .".[10] The assessment of the effect of the dentals on the ancient ear might be disputed, but the effect of the metre is clear. Lucretius affords an example of a parallel use of the dactylic metre:

> "namque papaueris aura potest suspensa leuisque
> cogere ut ab summo tibi diffluat altus aceruus,
> at contra lapidum conlectum spicarumque
> noenu potest . . . . "
>
> (De Rerum Natura III.196-9)

On this occasion it is poppy seeds that are tumbling down, and

the effect of the dactyls is highlighted by setting them in contrast with a line which not only has a spondee in the fifth foot, but which is the only line in Lucretius' work to end with four spondees.[11] These spondees speak of the static state of the stones and corn-ears.

Mimicry may occur in word order as well as in rhythm. In noting how Lucretius' "mimicry extends to the whole universe, including the dynamics of his own arguments", West remarks that "in I.514 only solid matter can have void concealed within its body and the word order imitates this, corpore inane suo celare".[12] Vergil makes equally effective use of word order in the simile he uses to describe the tearful Lavinia:

> "Indum sanguineo ueluti uiolauerit ostro
> si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa
> alba rosa: tales uirgo dabat ore colores".
> (Aeneid XII.67-9)

As with flushed cheeks in a pale face, the blood-red dye appears in the midst of the ivory, and the white lilies are in fact duly intermingled with the many roses.

It is now possible to understand why the description of the man at Lystra begins, "καί τις ἀνήρ, ἀδύνατος ἐν Λύστροις τοῖς ποσίν . . . . " (Acts 14.8). The word order is somewhat lame. That is precisely the point. The description matches the described. To attribute the word order to a pursuit of euphony, as Haenchen does,[13] is inaccurate as the ancients did not normally like rhyming.[14] If anything, it would be the ugly dissonance of "Λύστροις τοῖς" that would have been considered appropriate in this case. The expression as a whole would have tended to cause the reader to halt, as the

rendering "the man lame in Lystra" may similarly tend to do.

A second example in Acts of this kind of writing is to be found in the introduction of Aquila and Priscilla:

> "καὶ εὑρών τινα Ἰουδαῖον ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει, προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης...."
>
> (18.2)

Here Luke is describing the enforced displacement of the couple. It is reflected in the violently disruptive placing of the phrase, "καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ". Its placing should not, therefore, be regarded as unhappy, as suggested by Haenchen,[15] and there is certainly no need with Preuschen to entertain ideas of its being an insertion.[16]

Summary

The foregoing analysis and the examples presented in quotation show that a fully developed ἔκφρασις προσώπου comprises an asyndetic passage, nouns, adjectives, including especially present participles, to which is joined a clause or more introduced by the relative pronoun, which clauses may form a bridge to the narrative proper. This section may, alternatively, be succeeded by a clause or clauses introduced by a demonstrative pronoun, these in their turn constituting the smooth transition to the narrative. This whole sequence may be pervaded with a rhetorical sense of contrast, but may equally well exhibit a tendency towards oratorical repetitiousness, the orator of any age being fascinated by his own loquacious fecundity and ability to convey a point variously. Moreover, at any

point in the description the writer may so arrange the sound, rhythm, or order of the words that these factors are as indicative of the meaning as is the actual sense of the language.

B. The τόποι

The last two aspects of form which were discussed in the first part of this chapter were intimately bound up with content, and it is to the consideration of content that attention must now be turned. Since, however, the subject matter and significance of the character descriptions in Acts are a primary concern throughout the thesis, an exhaustive but superficial adumbration of the topics covered would be both tedious and unrewarding. Nevertheless, it will be helpful to indicate three regularly recurring elements and their possible significance in general terms, while leaving particular matters to the detailed analysis of specific contexts. One element which is conspicuous by its apparent absence may also be noted.

(1) Names

The vast majority of the actors in the history who are characterised are named. Macedonia's guardian angel (16.9) is naturally unnamed, for, were it desirable to think of him as having a name, it would presumably be 'Macedonia'. Although Aeneas is named (9.33), it is interesting to note that three of those who are not named, those mentioned at 3.2, 14.8, and 16.16, are people who are cured. This may be compared with the fact that in his gospel Luke does not include the name of Bartimaeus,[17] and may be an indication that his primary

interest does not lie with such disadvantaged people. The sons of Sceva (19.14), and the daughters of Philip (21.9) appear only under their fathers' names, but apart from that the only unnamed figures worth noting are the Ethiopian (8.27) and the Asiarchs (19.31).

In Acts there is a clear preference - 21 cases - for introducing the name by the use of the dative ὀνόματι which in all but five cases[18] precedes the name. The accusative of respect - τὸ ὄνομα - never occurs in Acts, nor does it appear in Luke's gospel. The phrase ᾧ ὄνομα appears only once (13.6), although it appears more frequently in Luke's gospel.[19] Only once is the participle of καλέω used,[20] although it also appears three times in Luke's gospel.[21] Whatever the exact verbal formulation used to introduce the name, its importance is indicated by the fact that the phrase including it almost invariably follows immediately upon that which first introduces the character to the story. The only clear exception is at 13.6 where the phrase, "ᾧ ὄνομα Βαριησοῦς" is the fifth item in the characterisation, and there is some evidence that it was a general rhetorical principle to introduce the name at the beginning of a characterisation.[22]

In addition to ordinary names, there is the matter of bynames or nicknames. In Acts may be noted, "ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος" (1.23), "ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρναβᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων" (4.36), "ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος" (10.5), and perhaps also "τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν" (1.23) and "ὁ

καλούμενος Νίγερ" (13.1). No doubt these secondary names are sometimes mentioned in order to distinguish between two people with the same name - two Josephs or two Simons - as when Polybius speaks of, "Ἀννίβας ὁ Μονομάχος ἐπικαλόμενος" (ix.24.5) in order to distinguish this man from the great Hannibal who is the main subject of the passage.

The matter should not, however, be left at that. When explaining how Gaius Marcius acquired the name Coriolanus, Plutarch slips into a digression on the topic of names:

> "ᾧ καὶ μάλιστα δῆλόν ἐστιν ὅτι τῶν ὀνομάτων ἴδιον ἦν ὁ Γάϊος, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον οἰκίας ἢ γένους κοινὸν ὁ Μάρκιος, τῷ δὲ τρίτῳ ὕστερον ἐχρήσαντο πράξεώς τινος ἢ τύχης ἢ ἰδέας ἢ ἀρετῆς ἐπιθέτῳ, καθάπερ Ἕλληνες ἐτίθεντο πράξεως μὲν ἐπώνυμον τὸν Σωτῆρα καὶ τὸν Καλλίνικον, ἰδέας δὲ τὸν Φύσκωνα καὶ τὸν Γρυπόν, ἀρετῆς δὲ τὸν Εὐεργέτην καὶ τὸν Φιλάδελφον, εὐτυχίας δὲ τὸν Εὐδαίμονα τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Βάττων. ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ σκώμματα παρέσχεν ἐπικλήσεις, ὡς Ἀντιγόνῳ τὸν Δώσωνα καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τὸν Λάθυρον. ἐπὶ πλέον δὲ τῷ γένει τούτῳ καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι κέχρηνται, Διαδήματόν τινα τῶν Μετέλλων καλέσαντες, ὅτι πολὺν χρόνον ἕλκος ἔχων περιενόστει διαδεδεμένος τὸ μέτωπον, ἕτερον δὲ Κέλερα σπεύσαντα μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀλίγας τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτῆς ἐπιταφίους μονομάχων ἀγῶνας παρασχεῖν, τὸ τάχος καὶ τὴν ὀξύτητα τῆς παρασκευῆς θαυμάσαντες. ἐνίους δὲ συντυχία γενέσεως μέχρι νῦν καλοῦσι, Πρόκλον μέν, ἐὰν ἀποδημοῦντος πατρὸς γένηται, καὶ Πόστουμον, ἂν τεθνηκότος· ᾧ δ' ἂν διδύμῳ γενομένῳ συμβῇ περιβιῶναι, θατέρου τελευτήσαντος Οὐοπίσκον. τῶν δὲ σωματικῶν οὐ μόνον Σύλλας οὐδὲ Νίγρους οὐδὲ Ῥούφους, ἀλλὰ καὶ Καίκους καὶ Κλωδίους ἐπωνυμίας τίθενται...."
>
> (Coriolanus xi.2-4)

This passage is sufficient in itself to indicate that the ancient reader would have been prepared to find real information about a person in his name. Consequently, having been told that Joseph was a "υἱὸς παρακλήσεως"(4.36), it would not have

been surprising to him to find the said Barnabas encouraging (παρεκάλει, 11.23) the brethren at Antioch. Or again, it would have been considered natural to be told openly that a magician had a name - Elymas - which indicated his trade (13.8).

Turning more specifically to the categories suggested by Plutarch, unless Barnabas is to be seen as actually named for his activities in Antioch, there is no name in Acts which is indubitably derived from a specific incident in the person's life. By way of contrast, in the case of names derived from bodily features there actually is one of the Roman names noted by Plutarch - Niger (13.1). In this area also may lie the explanation of the name Tabitha. The gazelle was named for its eyes. Perhaps, then, Dorcas would have been pictured as having large brown eyes, although the sceptical and scathing reference of Lucretius to a woman who is "neruosa et lignea" being described by her infatuated lover as "dorcas" (De Rerum Natura IV.1161) might rather suggest a reference to a lithe and athletic figure. It is even possible that the name suggests a relatively complete picture by implying both aspects. On the other hand, if the name Sapphira is indeed Aramaic and means 'the beautiful',[23] then it can fairly be assumed that all such significance was lost on the general reader.

Moving on to the matter of an especial virtue, there are two men in Acts called Justus (1.23, 18.7). It is most natural to take this as referring to their moral rectitude. Since, however, liberi iusti were legitimate children, it is

not impossible that this is one of those cases where the name is derived from an accident of birth, of which category Secundus (20.4) is a clear example.

Passing, finally, to the question of good fortune, there is Felix (24.24) and the equally obvious name of Eutychus (20.9) which is so precisely appropriate to the particular incident recounted of him that it is sorely tempting to think that this is indeed the occasion for which he is named, Plutarch's first category. Although there can be no certainty of this, there can be no doubt that the ancient reader would have enjoyed the correlation between name and circumstance.

In his section "περὶ ἐγκωμίου καὶ ψόγου" Theon makes some remarks on the question of understanding names:

> "χάριεν δέ ἐστιν ἐνίοτε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας ἢ τῶν ἐπωνυμιῶν ἐγκωμιάζειν, ἐὰν μὴ πάνυ φορτικὸν καὶ καταγέλαστον ᾖ, καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ὀνομάτων, οἷον Δημοσθένης ὅτι ἦν τὸ τοῦ δήμου σθένος· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας, ὅταν τις τύχῃ τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα ἔχων ἀνδρὶ δεδοξασμένῳ· ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐπωνυμιῶν οἷον Περικλῆς Ὀλύμπιος ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τοῖς κατορθώμασι μεγαλειότητος ἐπικεκλημένος."
>
> (8.229/II.111.3-11)

The almost certainly false etymology of Barnabas as 'son of encouragement' will be discussed in more detail at a later stage.[24] Τιμόθεος (16.1 etc.) and Θεόφιλος (1.1) are names which have obvious potential in this respect. Perhaps less clear is the case of Damaris (17.34). Since δάμαρ is a poetic word for a wife her name may be an indication that we should understand her status as a γυνή in a loaded sense, although this does not necessarily confirm the view of John Chrysostom that she was the wife of Dionysius.[25]

The element in Theon's remarks which really adds to what was noted from Plutarch is his suggestion that a name may be interpreted in terms of a famous predecessor of the same name. The possible significance of this in the case of Ananias will be considered later.[26] Meantime it is worth recalling that Vitruvius tells that the name of one of the co-architects of the Artemision at Ephesus was Demetrius (VII pref. 16). Hence Luke's rabble-rouser (19.24) may be named for the designer of the original of his ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς and therein may just possibly lie an explanation for the otherwise unattested form of these votive offerings.[27]

How much should be made of a name in any particular case is entirely dependent on the context. It is true that in Acts most of the names are just that and nothing more, but the fact that names are insignificant in most cases is no argument for seeing them as significant in none. Where there is a rapport between the name and the context, where the meaning or associations of the name seem peculiarly appropriate to the context and the context makes that meaning or association spring to mind, then the modern reader may be assured that such a texture in the writing would have delighted the ancient reader with his predisposition to look for significance in names. Not least would he have enjoyed the hint in the name Theophilus that the book was addressed to all friends of God.

(2) Origins

The second regularly recurring element in the character

sketches in Acts is a phrase giving some indication of the γένος, or race, or town of origin of the individual. Such an indication is given in just over half the sketches in the book: "Κύπριος τῷ γένει" (4.36); "Ἀντιοχέα" (6.5); "Αἰθίοψ" (8.27); "Ταρσέα" (9.11); "ὁ Κυρηναῖος" (13.1); "Ἰουδαῖον" (13.6); "Ἰουδαίας .... Ἕλληνος" (16.1); "Μακεδών" (16.9); "πόλεως Θυατίρων" (16.14); "Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει" (18.2); "Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει" (18.24); "Ἰουδαίου" (19.14); "Μακεδόνας" (19.29); "Κυπρίῳ" (21.16); "Ἰουδαῖος, Ταρσεύς" (21.39); "ὁ Ναζωραῖος" (22.8); "Ἰουδαίῳ" (24.24); "Μακεδόνος, Θεσσαλονικέως" (27.2). This list serves to highlight the close connection between these descriptions of individuals and the description of the Pentecost crowd "ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν" (2.5):

> "Πάρθοι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ Ἐλαμῖται, καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες
> τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν, Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν,
> Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν,
> Αἴγυπτον καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην,
> καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι, Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ
> προσήλυτοι, Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες...."
> (2.9-11)

(3) The Social Role

Thirdly, note should be taken of the frequency with which some indication is given of the profession, trade, or social role of an individual. Examples are: "νομοδιδάσκαλος" (5.34); "μαγεύων" (8.9); "εὐνοῦχος .... ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς" (8.27); "ἑκατοντάρχης" (10.1); "βυρσεῖ" (10.6); "ἑκατοντάρχης" (10.22); "παιδίσκη" (12.13);[28] "μάγον" (13.6); "τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ" (13.7); "πορφυρόπωλις" (16.14); "παιδισκήν" (16.16); "ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης" (17.34); "σκηνοποιοί"

(18.3); "ἀρχιερέως" (19.14); "ἀργυροκόπος" (19.24); "τῶν Ἀσιαρχῶν" (19.31); "ξήτορος" (24.1); "ἑκατοντάρχῃ" (27.1); "τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς νήσου"(28.7). Add to this list the occasions on which people are remarked to be prophets (11.28; 13.1; 21.1; 21.10), and there is ample evidence of the prominence of this kind of information in the character sketches in Acts.

(4) Physical Appearance

The type of information which might at first be expected, but of which very little is to be found, is information about an individual's physical appearance. Indeed, speaking of the whole New Testament, Wilder can remark with some justification that it is one of the characteristics of Christian literature that it contains no physical portraiture.[29]

In Acts, only the minimum of physical description is given in the cases of cripples who are healed (3.2; 14.8). In the case of Dorcas, Dibelius suggests that "perhaps some reference to her appearance is implied by the particular mention of the care of the corpse".[30]

Apart from cases of sickness, we have already noted[31] how appearance may from time to time be implied from a person's name. Similar inferences may have been drawn from a man's country of origin. The Ethiopian would almost certainly have been pictured as black[32] (and the statement that he was a eunuch may have contributed further to the conjuring up of a physical image). There may also have been, for example, a widely accepted ideal portrait

of a Macedonian of which an author would not have objected to his readers making use. Even a man's trade may have been expected to conjure up a visual image. It is fairly easy to see how this might have been the case with a centurion, and in the case of a tanner, or a leather worker, or a silversmith it is not beyond the bounds of credibility. Yet, even if all this is accepted, it only serves to emphasise that physical descriptions are at best rudimentary.

Conclusion

Given that name, place of origin, and trade are the most frequently proffered pieces of information, the conclusion to be drawn from this initial survey of the character sketches in Acts must be that they are primarily social rather than physical or even psychological in their concern. This conclusion is only confirmed by the fact that from time to time Luke actually describes someone in terms of his reputation: "τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ" (5.34); "ᾧ προσεῖχον πάντες" (8.10); "μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων" (10.22); "ὃς ἐμαρτυρεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Λύστροις καὶ Ἰκωνίῳ ἀδελφῶν" (16.2); "μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων" (22.12).

The predominant concern for an individual's social context serves as a reminder that when Luke describes people as proselytes (6.5), or as God-fearers (10.2,22), or as worshippers of God (16.14; 18.7), or as disciples (9.36; 16.1; 21.16), he is not talking of some private

quirk of their individual religious psyche. He is speaking about the religious aspect of their observable social status and context no less than he does when he speaks of people as magicians or Jews.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. A. Plummer, The International Critical Commentary: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke, 5th ed., (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922), p. xlvi. On Luke as a painter see Haenchen, op. cit., p. 90, n.1.

2. See E. C. Evans, "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography", Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 46 (1935), 43-84.

3. Gilbert Highet, Poets in a Landscape, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957), p. 17.

4. Cf. Quintilian (Institutio Oratoria 4.1.76-79) who does not approve of blending the preface with the narrative, but nevertheless thereby attests the prevalence of the doctrine.

5. On how Livy achieves this, see Walsh, Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods, pp. 180-1.

6. See section (1) Asyndeton, p. 33.

7. R. M. Ogilvie, A Commentary on Livy: Books 1-5, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 418. He cites Ab Urbe Condita II.xxxiii.5 and IV.xix.1 as examples.

8. Cf. Vergil, Aeneid, XI.340-1, and Josephus, Life, 1.1, both quoted below (pp. 58-59).

9. For the reasons for this see Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, p. 430.

10. L. P. Wilkinson, Golden Latin Artistry, (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), p. 73.

11. See E. J. Kenney, Lucretius: De Rerum Natura, Bk. III, (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), pp. 102 and 103, commentary on lines 191 and 198.

12. David West, The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius, (Edinburgh: University Press, 1969), pp. 123, 118. Cf. Propertius I.xvi.32: "surget et inuitis spiritus in lacrimis".

13. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 425, n.3.

14. The use of rhyme in verse is discussed by L. P. Wilkinson, op. cit., pp. 32-34, who cites E. Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa (Leipzig, 5th ed., 1898), pp. 810-908 for a history of the presence of rhyme in ancient literature.

15. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 534.

16. Cited ibid., p. 534 n.2.

17. Luke 18.35; cf. Mark 10.46.

18. Acts 5.1; 9.11; 9.12; 18.24; 19.24.

19. Luke 1.27; 2.25; 8.41 (Mark 5.22 reads: "ὀνόματι Ἰάϊρος"); cf. 1.6 "καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς".

20. Acts 7.58; but cf. 1.23 and 13.1 which are discussed below.

21. Luke 8.1; 10.39 (for reasons of uariatio); 19.2 (together with "ὀνόματι").

22. See below p. 112.

23. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 237 n.2.

24. See below p. 103. For the fallacy in the etymologising see Haenchen, op. cit., pp. 231-2.

25. Chrysostom, On the Priesthood, iv.7. His view is generally dismissed by modern commentators, e.g. Bruce, p.364 n.65; Haenchen, p.526 n.5; J. G. Griffiths, "Was Damaris an Egyptian?", Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge 8 (1964), pp. 293-5. The etymology which it is here suggested might have sprung to the ancient reader's mind excludes any idea that he would have understood the name primarily as a variant of δάμαλις, 'a heifer' (actually read by h).

26. See below p. 103.

27. On their unattested nature see Haenchen, op. cit., p. 572.

28. That Rhoda was a slave girl is in fact also implied by her name itself - see J. Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969), p. 346, who cites E. Preuschen, Die Apostelgeschichte, (Tübingen: 1912), p. 78.

29. A. N. Wilder, Early Christian Rhetoric, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1964), p. 46.

30. M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1956), p. 13.

31. See above, p. 48.

32. See e.g. Philostratus, Imagines, 7 "Mennon". From the LXX cf. the implication of Jeremiah 13.23: "εἰ ἀλλάξεται Αἰθίοψ τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ καὶ πάρδαλις τὰ ποικίλματα αὐτῆς", which is actually translated by John Bright (The Anchor Bible, Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, 2nd ed. (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1974), p. 93) as, "Can the Negro change his skin,/Or the leopard his spots?"

III

"Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him,
and saith of him,
Behold an Israelite indeed,
in whom is no guile!"

(St. John 1.47)

CHAPTER III

ΕΚΦΡΑΣΕΙΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΥ AS INTRODUCTIONS

The obituary notices which the historiographers provided for great men are perhaps more famous than the introductory sketches. Of the practice of making these valedictory remarks Seneca said:

> "hoc semel aut iterum a Thucydide factum, item in paucissimis personis usurpatum a Sallustio, T. Liuius benignius omnibus magnis uiris praestitis: sequentes historicis multo is effusius fecerunt".
>
> (Suasoriae VI.21)

Tacitus found it convenient, at the conclusion of his account of a given year, to provide a kind of full-stop by writing obituaries for any prominent men who had died during the course of it.[1] These passages are perhaps better known than the introductory sketches because, whereas they are about the famous, the introductions, as Walsh notes in the case of Livy,[2] are often of lesser known persons with whom the reader would not be familiar.

Yet the description of people on their first introduction into the story goes back, no doubt, to the rhetoricians' reading of Homer. The sketches of Calchas, Nestor, Thersites, and Nireus, to which allusion was made in the preceding chapter,[3] are all offered on the first appearance of the character on the scene. The sketch of Thersites is imitated in style and in function by Vergil when he introduces Drances:

> "largus opum, et lingua melior, sed frigida bello dextera, consiliis habitus non futilis auctor, seditione potens: genus huic materna superbum nobilitas dabat, incertum de patre ferebat"
>
> (Aeneid XI.338-41)

Coming closer to what would nowadays be recognised as historical writing, Josephus opens his "Life" by providing an introductory sketch of himself:

> "Ἐμοὶ δὲ γένος ἐστὶν οὐκ ἄδημον, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἱερέων ἄνωθεν καταβεβηκός. ὥσπερ δ' ἡ παρ' ἑκάστοις ἄλλη τίς ἐστιν εὐγενείας ὑπόθεσις, οὕτως παρ' ἡμῖν ἡ τῆς ἱερωσύνης μετουσία τεκμήριόν ἐστιν γένους λαμπρότητος. ἐμοὶ δ' οὐ μόνον ἐξ ἱερέων ἐστὶν τὸ γένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρώτης ἐφημερίδος τῶν εἰκοσιτεσσάρων, πολλὴ δὲ κἀν τούτῳ διαφορά, καὶ τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ φυλῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀρίστης. ὑπάρχω δὲ καὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους ἀπὸ τῆς μητρός· οἱ γὰρ Ἀσαμωναίου παῖδες ...."
>
> (I.1-2)

That set piece introductions were indeed common in historiography is suggested by a remark of Polybius:

> "καίπερ ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐν τοῖς προοιμίοις, ὥσπερ τῶν λοιπῶν συγγραφέων, προφερόμεθα τὰς τοιαύτας διαλήψεις, ἀλλ' ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀεὶ τὸν καθήκοντα λόγον ἁρμόζοντες ἀποφαινόμεθα περί τε τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν, νομίζοντες ταύτην οἰκειοτέραν εἶναι καὶ τοῖς γράφουσι καὶ τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσι τὴν ἐπισημασίαν."
>
> (X.26.9-10)

He underlines this preference for making comment during the course of the narrative over formal introductions[4] by excusing his own introductory portraits of Hannibal (IX.22.7) and Scipio (X.5.9) on the grounds that it was necessary to correct common misconceptions about them. In the face of this polemical statement of policy on the part of Polybius, it is not surprising to find rather elaborate, rhetorically polished introductory character sketches in other historiographers. One of the most outstanding must be Sallust's portrait of Catiline which is provided at a point where the actual narrative has not yet been embarked upon:

> "de quoius hominis moribus pauca prius explicanda sunt quam initium narrandi faciam. Lucius Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna ui et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo prauoque. huic ab adulescentia . . . . . ."
>
> (Cat. iv.5-v.1)

The brief sketch of Gnaeus Piso quoted earlier[5] is also an introduction and various other examples may be found in the Catiline, the Jugurtha, and the Histories.[6] As was noted earlier Livy adopts this approach in the case of minor characters,[7] but he also uses it in the case of some more significant ones - Hannibal (XXI.4.3ff) and Cato (XXXIX.40.4ff). Syme observes that Tacitus appears to introduce Annaeus Seneca and Afranius Burrus (Annals XIII.2), and Vitellius (Annals VI.32).[8]

The introductory principle can be neatly illustrated from Acts itself: "ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπεκρίθην· τίς εἶ, κύριε; εἶπέν τε πρὸς ἐμέ· ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, ὁ Ναζωραῖος, ὃν σὺ διώκεις" (22.8). Paul asks to be introduced and receives a reply in a brief, but by now clearly recognisable, form - name, place of origin (indicated in this case by an epithet), further information introduced by the relative pronoun.

Elsewhere too the dramatic situation is one in which two actors need to be introduced to each other. There is the case of Ananias and Saul where we find this passage:

> "ζήτησον ἐν οἰκίᾳ Ἰούδα, Σαῦλον ὀνόματι, Ταρσέα· ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσεύχεται, καὶ εἶδεν ἄνδρα [ἐν ὁράματι], Ἀνανίαν ὀνόματι εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρας, ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃ."
>
> (9.11-12)

The reader is told how each is given a description of the other, the description that Saul receives of Ananias being

more or less included in the description that Ananias hears of Saul. It is interesting that although Saul is only described as seeing - εἶδεν ἄνδρα - , the description follows the normal pattern of beginning with the name, information far more likely to be conveyed in auditory form.

Another case where two actors mutually require introduction is that of Peter and Cornelius. Hence Cornelius receives a description of the man for whom he is to send, which includes a description of that man's host of the moment (10.5-6). And the messengers he sends, having made effective practical use of the above description, proceed to introduce themselves to Peter in terms of a description of the man who has sent them and is sending for him (10.22). The fact that these introductions are not repeated when the story is again recounted for a different dramatic audience in chapters eleven and fifteen is an indication of the degree to which they are intended for the reader rather than for the actors in the drama.

A fourth case of mutual introduction is found in chapters twenty-one and twenty-two, in the exchanges between Paul and the tribune. Even here, where dramatic effect is a high priority, the formal patterns still show through, especially in Paul's introduction of himself (21.39).

The introductory nature of the character sketch can also be illustrated in a negative fashion from the way in

which Luke speaks of the prophets and teachers in the church at Antioch:

> "Ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι ὅ τε Βαρναβᾶς καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ, καὶ Λούκιος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Μαναήν τε Ἡρῴδου τοῦ τετραάρχου σύντροφος καὶ Σαῦλος."
>
> (13.1)

The three who receive some further delineation over and above their names are those who are being introduced to the reader for the first time. Of Barnabas and Saul, who are mentioned by name only, the reader already knows. That these two appear at the beginning and end of the list may reflect an aesthetic preference, a seeking after balance on the part of Luke. For in listing the Seven (6.5) only the first and last on the list receive delineation beyond their names. This is understandable in the case of Stephen at the beginning of the list in that he is about to play a significant role. In the case of Nicolaus, however, he is never to be mentioned again, and aesthetic balance seems the most likely and least speculative explanation of his further designation as "προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχέα".[9]

Practically all the character sketches in Acts are in fact introductory in function, at least to some degree. The following are all clearly characterised on their first appearance: the lame man (3.2), Barnabas (4.36-37), Ananias and Sapphira (5.1ff), Gamaliel (5.34), Simon Magus (8.9-10), the Ethiopian (8.27-28), Aeneas (9.33), Tabitha (9.36), Cornelius (10.1-2), Elymas (13.6-8), the man lame from birth (14.8), Timothy (16.1-3), Lydia (16.14), the girl prophetess (16.16-17), Aquila and Prisca (18.2-3), Titius

Justus (18.7), Apollos (18.24-25), Demetrius (19.24-25), Mnason (21.16), and Julius (27.1). Very brief phrases perform the same function for several other characters: Joseph (1.23), Stephen (6.5), Saul (7.58), Ananias (9.10), Agabus (11.27), Rhoda (17.13), Dionysius and Damaris (17.34), Scaeva's sons (19.14), Gaius and Aristarchus (19.29), Eutychus (20.9), Tertullus (24.1), Drusilla (24.24), and Poplius (28.7).

The introductory function of these descriptions is reflected in Luke's language. In some two-thirds - thirty-one cases - the word 'τις' is used near the beginning.[10] The Latin equivalent is found in some of Sallust's introductory sketches. He uses the phrase "Numida quidam" in introducing Massiva, Gauda, and Aspar, as well as "Hamilcarem quendam".[11] This use of 'τις' reflects good literary style. The use of 'καὶ ἰδού' may have less to do with a literary education and more to do with the influence of the LXX,[12] but it is equally indicative of the introductory function of these sketches: "καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνήρ" (8.27); "καὶ ἰδοὺ ἑξαυτῆς τρεῖς ἄνδρες" (11.11); "καὶ ἰδοὺ μαθητής" (16.1). At 1.10, 10.30, and 12.7 the phrase introduces a divine visitor.

The major sketches which remain to be considered are those which Paul gives of himself in his own defence. These are introductory in the sense that in each case he is introducing himself to his dramatic audience. For the reader, however, they come at the end of the story of Paul and, as is implied by 20.25, just before his death. They are thus similar to the obituary notices mentioned at the

beginning of the chapter.[13]

Overall, it would appear that Luke offers no introduction in the case of major public figures like Gallio or Felix. Presumably his readers are expected to know of them already. On the other hand, he formally introduces Church figures and other minor characters, even as historians such as Livy introduce their minor characters. The lack of formal delineation in the case of Peter may be explained partly by his having featured in the Gospel, partly by accepting that Luke does not wish to imply that he is a minor figure. The difference in the case of Paul is that he is summed up in a validictory way, and thus treated as the major actor in the history, in the same way as Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus bid farewell to important actors in the dramas they describe.

This conclusion indicates that it would be misleading unequivocally to endorse the view of Nock:

> "While the author clearly regarded the theme of his narrative as a heroic age, he gave no such personal characterisations of the leading speakers as were common in ancient history. (Minor figures are described, just as the speech of Tertullus in 24 shows ethos)".[14]

That minor figures are described does coincide with the practice of ancient historiography, as does the fact that the dominant heroic figure is described not at the beginning but at the culmination of his career. By thus following established practice, Luke the more effectively allows Paul to dominate the work. The introductions introduce the Church, the intended audience presumably standing in need of such familiarisation. Paul fulfils this introduction

of the Church.

Finally, it is worth digressing to note the practice of J. MacDougall Hay at the beginning of this century, for in respect of his introductory sketches he proves to stand securely in the classical tradition, as the comments of the critics who introduce the more recent edition of his novel "Gillespie" make clear: "The description of Spider is a brilliant piece of invective, comic and yet frightening. Long introductory descriptions are a feature of the book related to other aspects of Hay's narrative method: he tells a great deal about the characters in these set-piece descriptions and prepares us, often very fully, for their subsequent actions".

> "He was on his way now to Nathanael McAskill to have his agreement with Lonend drawn out in proper form. This gentleman was nicknamed the Spider - a tall, one-eyed man, thin as a wire, with spindly legs, who had the appearance of bearing down upon one like a landslide. He was learned in the filthy secrets of the town, and had the look of a lean fox as he hung in the offing like a pirate, and came to heel at a nod. He was a suave liar. His clean-shaven face was smoothed with perjury. He was relied upon at certain festivities as a singer of indecent songs. This was his popular accomplishment. He knew law, and had been a clever student at Glasgow University in the old days, when the University was situate in the High Street. He was especially clever at conveyancing; had no friends or relatives; was one of that sort of miserable men whose name was most frequently used as a subject for a jibe; and he was so degraded that he acquiesced in the jibe. One can imagine him fawning upon the devil when Satan gathered him by main force to the Pit. No one believed that he could be herded there by wile.
>
> "He was as bland as wine and as sparkling, when men hatched plots with him, and the whisky was between them. His lean face would be eagerly cocked, his single eye bright, like a pecking bird's, and his tongue ready either for defamation, a witticism, or a story, as it suited the humour of his client. But there was nothing rapacious in him or venomous.

He simply did sharp things to satisfy the cunning of his nature. Altogether too silky and sleuth-like, and a dangerous tool; but a golden solicitor; for he was such a despised devil that retaliation was sure to fall upon him and not upon his client. Therefore, when Gillespie buttoned up the agreement and walked out of his dingy office, saying it would take more than Lonend's teeth to bite through the bargain, and that he would see the lawyer later, Nathanael McAskill wetted his thin lips with the point of his tongue and smiled, recognising that he had met a rogue peer to himself".[15]

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. See R. Syme, "Obituaries in Tacitus", in Ten Studies in Tacitus (Oxford: University Press, 1970), p. 79.

2. Walsh, Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods, pp. 85-86 - noting e.g. Ab Urbe Condita II.32.8 and XXII.2.2.

3. See above pp. 37, 34, 32, 33.

4. For this interpretation of 'προοιμίοις' see F. W. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), ad loc.

5. See above, p. 37.

6. For the use of introductions in the Histories see Syme, Sallust, pp. 195-208.

7. See above p. 58 and n.2; cf. also Ogilvie as quoted on p. 38 above.

8. Syme, Ten Studies in Tacitus, pp. 83-84.

9. The list of apostles (1.13) is also patterned, but differently - 4,2 plus 2, 3. The similarity is that the last three have more than a single name. J. A. Brinkman, "The Literary Background to the 'Catalogue of Nations'", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 418-427, detects a chiastic pattern in the list of nations at 2.9-11.

10. "καί τις ἀνήρ" (3.2); "ἀνὴρ δέ τις" (5.1); "ἀναστὰς δέ τις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Φαρισαῖος" (5.34); "ἀνὴρ δέ τις" (8.9); "ἦν δέ τις μαθητής" (9.10); "ἀνθρωπόν τινα" (9.33); "ἐν Ἰοππῇ δέ τις ἦν μαθήτρια" (9.36); "ἀνὴρ δέ τις" (10.1); "Σίμωνά τινα" (10.5); "τινι Σίμωνι" (10.5); "ἦσαν δέ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες" (11.20); "ἄνδρα τινα" (13.6); "καί τις ἀνήρ" (14.8); "μαθητής τις" (16.1); "ἀνὴρ Μακεδών τις" (16.9); "καί τις γυνή" (16.14); "παιδίσκην τινα" (16.16); "τινες δὲ ἄνδρες" (17.34); "τινα Ἰουδαῖον" (18.2); "ἦλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν τινός" (18.7); "Ἰουδαῖος δέ τις" (18.24); "τινες καὶ τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων" (19.13); "Τινος Σκευᾶ" (19.14); "Δημήτριος γάρ τις" (19.24); "Τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀσιαρχῶν" (19.31); "καθεζόμενος δέ τις νεανίας" (20.9); "τις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας προφήτης" (21.10); "Μνάσωνί τινι" (21.16); "Ἀνανίας δέ τις" (22.12); "πρεσβυτέρων τινῶν .... Τερτύλλου τινός" (24.1).

11. Sallust, Jugurtha, xxv; lxv; cviii; lxxvii.

12. See Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, p. 150 on Acts 1.10.

13. See further, Ch. VII below.

14. A. D. Nock, Review of M. Dibelius Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, Gnomon 25 (1953), pp. 497-506, (quotation from p. 498).

15. J. MacDougall Hay, Gillespie, (1914); with an introduction by Bob Tait and Isobel Murray, (Edinburgh and Vancouver: Canongate, 1979), pp. xiv, 65-66.

IV

"A somewhat remarkable instance recurs to me. In Liverpool, now half a century ago, I saw under the shadow of the great dingy street-wall of Prince's Dock (an obstruction long since removed) a common sailor, so intensely black that he must needs have been a native African of the unadulterate blood of Ham. A symmetric figure much above the average height. The two ends of his gay silk handkerchief thrown loose about the neck danced upon the displayed ebony of his chest; in his ears were big hoops of gold, and a Scotch Highland bonnet with a tartan band set off his shapely head.

"It was a hot noon in July, and his face, lustrous with perspiration, beamed with barbaric good humour. In jovial sallies right and left, his white teeth flashing into view, he rollicked along, the center of a company of his shipmates. These were made up of such an assortment of tribes and complexions as would have well fitted them to be marched up by Anacharsis Cloots before the bar of the first French Assembly of Representatives of the Human Race. At each spontaneous tribute rendered by the wayfarers to this black pagoda of a fellow - the tribute of a pause and stare, and less frequent an exclamation - the motley retinue showed that they took that sort of pride in the evoker of it which the Assyrian priests doubtless showed for their grand sculptured Bull when the faithful prostrated themselves.

"To return."

Herman Melville
"Billy Budd"

CHAPTER IV

ΕΚΦΡΑΣΕΙΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΥ AS DIGRESSIONS

Digressions or παρεκβάσεις require no extensive introduction as a feature of historiography. With Sallust particularly in mind, Earl accords them four functions: firstly to give necessary amplification or explanation of the text, secondly to give the reader variety and relief, thirdly to give the author an opportunity to display his learning, and fourthly to perform the structural function of marking a climax or stage in the argument or narrative.[1] Ogilvie says that Tacitus follows Sallust and Livy in respect of this fourth function, using digressions in the Agricola to mark the climaxes of Agricola's career.[2]

In his Sather Classical Lectures,[3] Walbank notes that Polybius breaks off to discuss the purpose of history, to compare universal history with monographs, to assess previous writers, and to speak of his own experiences and interests. He points out that three whole books of Polybius are basically digressions: book six is on the Roman constitution and army, book twelve is a criticism of Timaeus and other predecessors, and book thirty-four is on geography. This last example is illustrative of the fact that a digression often takes the form of a description or ἔκφρασις. Thus, sensing the digressive quality of the description, Walbank remarks during this discussion of digressions in Polybius that "there are also many character sketches of individuals which spring naturally out of certain

contexts and should not, I suppose, strictly speaking be regarded as digressions".[4] Wardman too is of the opinion that character study in the historians tends to be a digression, although he considers that such studies fit in with the moral purpose of many of these writers.[5] Kennedy holds a similar view when he classifies the descriptions of Jugurtha, Marius and Sulla in Sallust's Jugurtha along with the description of Africa.[6] Walsh adopts a like approach to the character sketches in Livy,[7] and Syme says of Tacitus: "The obituary, like the historical excursus, can supply variety, tighten a link, or permit a transition most elegant and insidious".[8] For, as the first function listed by Earl suggests, in a good historiographer all digressions belong to their context. They may not advance the history as story, but they are intended to advance the ἱστορία, the inquiry.

The digressive quality of the character sketch may be illustrated in a small way from Acts itself by considering the way in which Titius Justus is introduced (18.7). Luke is telling of Paul leaving the synagogue in Corinth for another venue in the city at which to preach. Naturally he wishes to define the house fairly precisely, and to do so mentions its owner. After this mention of him, however, the form of the introductory character sketch takes over with the phrase, "σεβομένου τὸν θεόν," and a clause introduced by the relative pronoun: "οὗ ἡ οἰκία συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ". Thus

information about the situation of the house is conveyed to the reader not in the direct course of the narrative, but as part of a description of its owner. That this sentence becomes more and more detached from the narrative proper is illustrated by the author's repetition of the word "οἰκίᾳ", and the fact that "ἐκεῖθεν" and "τῇ συναγωγῇ" refer to the same location.

The occurrence of this verbal repetition and reminiscence is a reminder of the basic nature of a digression. It consists in starting at a point, wandering from it, and coming back to it. Thus Tacitus gives us an account of Agricola's life up to his appointment as governor of Britain, he then breaks off to detail the geography and the history of the Roman conquest of the province (Agricola 10-17), which brings us back to the point of Agricola's arrival in Britain. In the brief phrases which we are considering in Acts, the verbal repetition is indicative of the fact that Luke starts with the theme of leaving the synagogue for the house, and ends his description of Titius by saying that his house is adjacent to the synagogue. Consequently, in the resumed narrative, talk of the ἀρχισυνάγωγος comes very naturally. It is tempting to see the pattern synagogue/house/house/synagogue as deliberately chiastic, but the effective principle is that of simple ring composition. We start with matters relating to the synagogue and return to them. In the same way we find in Luke's Gospel, when he gives the genealogy of Jesus (3.22-38), that the voice from heaven describes him as, "ὁ υἱός μου," and the genealogy finishes off with "τοῦ θεοῦ". The reader is returned to the point at which

the narrative broke off, and Luke can resume his tale of Jesus in relationship with the Holy Spirit.

The pattern of departure from and return to a theme is used in a more sophisticated manner by Sallust at the point where he gives us his character sketch of Sempronia (Catiline xxv). Before her introduction the topic is that of the consular elections. After it the topic is the same. The difference lies in that he is concerned with two separate sets of elections; before the description, that for the consuls of 63 B.C. and after, that for those of 62. Thus the historiographer could use a digression, in this case in the form of a character sketch, to allow for the passage of time between two events when he was either unable or unwilling to recount the intervening history. Syme puts it that Sempronia is needed to fill a space and let an uninteresting time pass.[9]

A clear example from Acts of this use of the digression is the character sketch of Apollos (18.24-28), which marks the end of that stage in the narrative of the Church which first took it to Achaea, to Athens and Corinth. Luke offers no description of Paul's progress through Galatia and Phrygia, but, in order to make allowance for the fact that there would be an inevitable lapse of time before the traveller arrived in Ephesus, he interposes the introductory description of Apollos. This is duly flanked by references to an identical event in the phrases, "διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν ",

(18.23) and, "διελθόντα τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη", (19.1).[10] In a curiously attractive way, however, the overt reference to the synchronous nature of the activities of Paul and Apollos comes in the form of saying that Paul arrived in Ephesus while Apollos was in Corinth (19.1), rather than saying that Apollos arrived in Ephesus while Paul was passing through the upper regions.

A second function of the description of Sempronia in Sallust is to illustrate the nature of the Catilinarian faction as a whole. Sallust has just given a general description of the group when he singles her out - "sed in iis erat Sempronia" - clearly with the object of presenting the reader with a more memorable image in the form of a portrait of a typical, if also exceptional individual.

At Acts 4.32-5.11 and 8.4-40 there are passages where a general description or statement is succeeded by sketches of individual characters. In the next chapter an explanation will be offered as to why it is that each of these two passages can reasonably be treated as a single unit of interpretation, and hence as a picture illustrative of the nature of the Church as a whole at a particular stage in its growth, as well as a digression allowing for the passage of time between two events.

It is not unlikely that Luke intends that Apollos should similarly fulfil this apparently paradoxical role of standing out from and yet at the same time typifying the group, in this case the Church. What makes it

formally less certain than the cases already noted is the absence of a preceding description in general terms. Yet it may be treated as a broadly representative portrait for the following reason. It is clearly a digression that provides variety in the midst of an otherwise unvaried account of the activities of Paul. Offering this relief, it draws attention to itself. If, then, Apollos is basically an eccentric figure, Luke is drawing attention to the atypical, and he is unlikely so to confuse his readers. Hence, on psychological if not on directly formal grounds, it may be argued that the characterisation is broadly intended to typify the Church.

Considerable difficulties of historical interpretation are associated with the case of Apollos.[11] Here, however, discussion of his case will as usual be circumscribed by concentrating, not on what history may lie behind the report, but on what the ancient reader might have made of the material before him.

The first thing mentioned of Apollos is that he was a Jew. It is not unusual for Luke to mention the Jewish connections of an individual Christian: Timothy was the son of a Jewess (16.1-3), Aquila is introduced as a Jew (18.2), and it is probable that Crispus, the ἀρχισυνάγωγος (18.8), was a Jew also. In addition, Lydia (16.14) and Titius Justus (18.7) are described as 'worshipping God', and Cornelius (10.22) as 'fearing God'. Before the time of Cornelius' conversion the implication is, of course, that all converts were Jews, and since Nicolaus was a

proselyte (6.5) it would appear that, in this respect at least, full proselytes were regarded as on the same footing as born Jews.[12] The only possible exception in the first ten chapters of Acts is the Ethiopian, and even he is presented as previously worshipping in Jerusalem and reading scripture (8.27-28).

After the conversion of Cornelius, besides the particular cases just noted, there are also general references which reinforce this impression of a Jewish connection. In Salamis, Cyprus, Barnabas and Saul speak only in the synagogues of the Jews, and when they do convert a gentile on that island it is only because he, the proconsul, was already under the influence of Jewish teaching, false though that may have been (13.5-12). At Pisidian Antioch Paul and Barnabas start in the synagogue and make many converts among Jews and God-fearing proselytes, moving to the gentiles only under pressure, with the reference to converts amongst these being more vague (13.43-49). At Iconium Luke speaks only of converts being made at the synagogue, Jews and worshippers of God.[13] Nothing is specifically said of the origins of the disciples in either Lystra or Derbe. Moving on to Greece, in Thessalonica only teaching in the synagogue is specifically mentioned, and those converted are Jews, worshipping Greeks, and women (17.1-4). In Beroea again only teaching in the synagogue is mentioned, and the converts are Jews, women, and in this case also men (17.10-12). It is only with the arrival of Paul at Athens that he is found voluntarily proclaiming the gospel in a public place as well as in the synagogue. In Corinth the movement to the gentiles is

once again made under duress, and Luke is much more specific about the Jews converted and about the Greeks who heard him in the synagogue than about the many Corinthians (18.4-8). Back in Ephesus he first argues only with the Jews in the synagogue (18.19), and on his return only at the very end are Greeks mentioned (19.10, cf. v. 17).

From this survey it is clear that, both in individual and in general references, Luke's description of the converts to the Church is pervaded with a sense of the intimate relationship of the Church with Judaism. Since, however, there can be no questioning the premium which he placed on the move to the gentiles, a move spelt out very clearly in one of the last phrases in the book, "γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τοῦτο τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ· αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται ", some explanation must be offered for the firmness with which he yet binds together Jews and Christians. Such an explanation might be offered in terms of the theory that he is trying to argue that Christianity should be treated by the Romans as a <u>religio licita</u>, that is essentially as a sect within the Jewish religion.[14] Some have gone so far as to suggest that he anticipates the apologists in presenting Christians as the true Israel in order to defend them from official attack. The Church should inherit the privileges of the Jewish religion, while the Jews themselves can go the way of Sosthenes.[15]

There are three major objections to any approach based broadly along these lines. The first is that, while it

would appear to offer firm explanation based on an apologetic intention for Luke's attitude to Judaism, it affords no corresponding explanation for his positive concern over the Church's involvement with the gentiles. His concern on that side has to be understood from some non-apologetic, theological base which would probably have been incomprehensible to the outside reader. The second objection is that it is normally assumed that those outside the Church were in any case unable to distinguish it from Judaism. For example, when it is suggested that Suetonius' phrase "impulsore Chresto" refers to disturbances brought about by the activity of Christian missionaries amongst the Jews of Rome,[16] such an interpretation is dependent on his being unable or unwilling to differentiate between Jews and Christians. Hence it is improbable, although not actually impossible, that an apologist for Christianity should have expended energy on trying to demonstrate that the two should be regarded as on the same footing. The third and fatal objection is that the phrase religio licita appears to refer only to an unconfirmed hypothesis of Mommsen about the status of Jews after 70 A.D.,[17] and that no clear evidence has been brought forward to demonstrate that there was in the Roman Empire such a thing as an officially recognised religion apart from the condoning of local ethnically based cults.

The attitude expounded by Juster at the beginning of this century affords a much more secure basis for understanding

Luke's simultaneous concern with the Church's connection with Judaism and its incorporation of gentiles into itself. The opening statement of his first chapter on the privileges of the Jews is the important one that "l'antiquité respectait à un très haut degré le principe de la liberté religieuse".[18] Later, taking account of edicts of Claudius,[19] he remarks about restriction on these privileges that "une condition plutôt théorique pour les Juifs privilégiés fut de ne pas attaquer la religion de leurs concitoyens, sous peine de déchéance de leurs privilèges".[20] And, arguing directly against Mommsen's theory that after 70 A.D. the Jews ceased to be recognised as a nation and were only recognised as a religion, a religio licita, he says:

> "La théorie de la nation devenue confession est violemment contredite par les faits. Les Juifs, continuant à jouir de leurs privilèges - ce qui est prouvé par les documents, et admis par Mommsen lui-même - ne pouvaient en jouir qu'en tant que membres d'une nation et non en tant que participants d'un culte licite, puisque la religion juive ne fut jamais reconnue comme un culte pouvant être librement adopté et intégralement exercé par les sujets de l'Empire. Bien au contraire, tout l'effort du droit romain est, de plus en plus, d'empêcher ceux qui ne sont pas Juifs de naissance d'embrasser le judaïsme. La pratique de celui-ci n'est donc permise qu'aux membres de la nation juive. Par conséquent, les privilèges juifs sont des privilèges attachés à titre héréditaire à tous les Juifs ethniquement Juifs, ils appartiennent donc à la nation juive et bien loin d'être des privilèges d'un culte, ils sont ceux d'un peuple . . . . les textes législatifs emploient pour désigner les Juifs les termes de NATION, PEUPLE".[21]

Accepting, then, that Judaism was not a cult which anyone in the Empire who so wished was free to practise, and that objections to it focused on attempts to proselytise, it would be no defence whatsoever for an obviously missionary

movement like the Church as portrayed in Acts simply to claim that it was more or less Jewish. That would only mark it the more clearly as objectionable, a Jewish sect with marked proselytising tendencies.

On the other hand, given that the outsider generally assumed that the Church was part of Judaism, it is immediately obvious why this missionary movement would find itself under attack. It could offer two arguments in its defence: firstly, that since those who were becoming members of the Church were already Jews, or at least in some way involved with Judaism, it could not be justly accused of proselytising to Judaism; secondly, that since gentiles who became members of the Church were not accepted as Jews but remained gentiles, again it could not justly be accused of proselytising to Judaism. As evidence of the influence of this second type of argumentation on Acts, it will serve here to mention firstly the crucial individual case of Trophimus the Ephesian who, though a Christian, was yet a gentile (21.29), and secondly the general assertion that Christians did not need to be circumcised nor follow the full rigours of the dietary laws - two of the most notorious marks of Judaism. The continuing Jewishness of Jewish Christians, on the other hand, may be exemplified by the circumcision of Timothy (16.1-4), and Paul's undertaking purification in the temple at Jerusalem (21.20-26).[22]

Such argumentation that the missionary Church was not a proselytising Jewish sect, since its gentile members remained gentiles and its Jewish ones Jews, would only cut ice in a

context in which it was quite specifically Jewish expansionism, and not religious expansionism in general, that was under attack. This would in fact fit well with the history of the Empire in which individual cults were repressed intermittently and locally. Only when a particular religion was becoming unduly vociferous or troublesome, was popular antagonism significantly aroused or official action taken, and that usually only within a relatively limited area. Thus arguments that the Church's missionary activity was not proselytising would indeed be relevant to, and in principle at least, adequate to combat the kind of specific hostility that arose in the Empire.

From this discussion it is clear that the designation of Apollos as a Jew need not be regarded simply as the conveying of an objective piece of information which Luke happened to have to hand, but may be seen as a loaded and argumentative statement.

Passing over his name for the present, the third piece of information given about Apollos is that he was an Alexandrian. It is generally assumed that this means that he was a citizen of the great Alexandria in Egypt. Alexander White's evocative homiletic portrait of him is based on this assumption,[23] and is, no doubt, only an exemplary representative of many such. Nor is this assumption confined to homiletics, as a glance at Bruce, or Haenchen, or Barrett's commentary on I Corinthians will confirm.[24] Yet it was by no means the only Alexandria. Far nearer to Ephesus was Alexandria Troas, which, according to Suetonius,[25] was

significant enough for Caesar to have considered it as a possible new capital for the Empire. Hemer[26] has shown that, while when the city became Colonia Augusta Troadensium it was thenceforth known in ordinary usage as Troas, in Greek the ethnic shifted more tardily from Ἀλεξανδρεύς, to Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἀπὸ Τρῳάδος , to Τρῳαδεύς. Indeed, a writer as late as Athenaeus (c. A.D. 200) could on one occasion refer to Hegesianax, who came from Troas, simply as, "Ἡγησιάναξ ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεύς".[27] Thus, that Luke elsewhere[28] refers to the city itself as Troas is no objection to 'Alexandrian' here referring to one of its citizens.

It is true that elsewhere in Acts 'Alexandrians' may refer to citizens of the Egyptian Alexandria: "ἀνέστησάν δέ τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτίνων καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας" (6.9). There, if the reference is intended to be to Egypt, then it is necessary to understand Luke as wishing to couple Alexandria closely with Cyrene, another North African city, and as intending clearly to distinguish it from the provinces of Cilicia and Asia. Here, however, in the case of Apollos and his Alexandria, there can be little doubt about the associated city. It is Ephesus, a city of the Roman province of Asia. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Alexandria in that same province would have been the first to spring to an ancient reader's mind. There is at least a sufficient element of doubt about Apollos' citizenship to dissuade the sensitive reader from any determination to see him as

emanating from a background of Philonic-type Judaism, and sufficient also to obviate any necessity to see Luke as wishing to associate the Church too closely with the notoriously troublesome Jewish community in the Ptolemies' Alexandria.

Given the possibility that Apollos came from Alexandria Troas, his very name would have been a potential source of sophisticated pleasure for an ancient reader. The city was obviously very closely associated with Troy, and from Homer onwards Troy was associated with Apollo Smintheus[29] who throughout the Iliad shows great favour towards the city. Also, although according to the myth she did not entirely appreciate the favour, Priam's daughter Alexandra (Cassandra) was one of the girls towards whom Apollo, in amorous mood, most famously directed his attentions. Hence the name Apollonius, whether in its full form or in the shortened form of Apollos, would have been a most suitable name for a citizen of Alexandria Troas.

A more important consequence of understanding Apollos to be from the province of Asia lies in this. The mission as Luke describes it is conducted in the Levant, Cyprus, modern Asia Minor and Greece, and eventually in Rome. Most of those who are not found in their native towns are yet from somewhere within that sphere: Barnabas is a Cypriot (4.36), Saul from Tarsus (9.11 etc.), Nicolaus an Antiochean (6.5), Gaius from Derbe (20.4), Lydia from Thyatira (16.14), Tychicus and Trophimus the Ephesian from Asia (20.4), Aquila from Pontus (18.2), Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica,

Sopater from Beroea (20.4), Cornelius is associated with the σπείρη Ἰταλική (10.1), and as a proconsul Sergius Paulus (13.7) was bound to be associated with Rome. Only two individuals come from outwith this missionary area,[31] the Ethiopian (8.27) and Lucius the Cyrenian who is resident in Antioch (13.1). Only two general remarks have a wider reference: although their immediate provenance must be seen as Jerusalem, it was men from Cyprus and Cyrene who according to Luke started speaking to Greeks in Antioch (11.19-20); and since he says that three thousand were baptised after Peter's Pentecost sermon (2.41), perhaps some cognisance should be taken of the variety of the crowd on that occasion (2.9-11), although fully a third of the areas mentioned are in Asia Minor and all are resident in Jerusalem.[32] The balance of interest, therefore, is absolutely clear. From the death of Stephen on, it lies very largely, although not quite exclusively, with the Greek-speaking world on the northern shores of the Mediterranean or with Rome. This is true not only of the geographical sphere of activity, but equally of the figures who are pushed to the forefront, for the stories in which Peter appears are not dominated by him.[33] The only thoroughly eccentric figure in the whole book is the Ethiopian, but how what in him is to be considered typical is effectively controlled will be discussed in the next chapter.[34] If Apollos were to be seen as of Egyptian origin, for all the Hellenic nature of that Alexandria, he would be another prominent and atypical figure, and in his case there would be nothing

in the literary form in which he is introduced to control the effect of that on the mind of the reader. If he can be seen as from Alexandria Troas, he would be a thoroughly typical and typifying figure, which is what the form of the digression would broadly suggest.

The fourth piece of information offered about Apollos is that he is an "ἀνὴρ λόγιος". It has already been said that there is no need to see this as set in contrast with "δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς".[35] Indeed, it would be aesthetically preferable for the descriptive phrases on either side of the intrusive narrative phrase "κατηντήσεν εἰς Ἔφεσον" to have a similar reference and thus bind the ἔκφρασις together. Both phrases in fact suggest an intellectually able and educated man. (Those commentators who allow that λόγιος implies both eloquence and education are probably in the right, considering that Greek education was above all in and for eloquence). The second phrase serves to highlight one area of his competence, a religious one.

This impression of educated ability stands in some contrast with the earlier assertion that Peter and John were "ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοι . . . . καὶ ἰδιῶται " (4.13). It is possible that Luke wishes to paint a picture of the Church growing away from the ignorant to the educated. That Peter and John were no skilled orators is, however, part of their defence, part of a standard rhetorical argument on Luke's part that ordinary, simple folk are most likely to tell the truth.[36] Further, neither of

them is specifically characterised and introduced. Hence, although the image of truthfulness may have general application, it is possible that the description of them which here argues for it is argumentative purely in the specific context. It would not, then, be intended to form part of the general overall portrait of the Church. The picture of Apollos, on the other hand, is formally painted and illustrative in function. Hence the impression it conveys of the Church moving in learned if religious circles may be assumed to have a general application.

Coming curiously after the picture of him as able and educated, the fifth aspect of this portrait of Apollos is that he stands in need of some correction as regards the nature of 'the way' (the section being neatly bracketed by two references to "τὴν ὁδόν"). If the ancient reader had read Luke's gospel, he would have been able to make something of the reference to the baptism of John. Even if he had not, he would have been able to see that Luke is saying here that some of the teaching about the Church, even some from apparently reputable sources, is inaccurate and partial. Is it part of his apologetic that he wishes to suggest that some of the things which people may have heard about the Church may not have been exactly true? In the next chapter evidence will be offered which suggests that Apollos' willingness to be corrected may be intended as an indication of his modesty.[37]

The final image of Apollos is of a person the more

closely identified with the Church and the more clearly in opposition to the Jews, which is a trifle paradoxical considering the way in which he himself was first introduced. This dialectical relationship between the Church and Judaism is personified in this representative individual as it is also in other figures, notably Paul. Even if the stylisation of opponents as 'the Jews' was pure habit with the author, it must still be asked what an uninitiate audience would have made of it. The answer must be that it would have given the impression that the Church was not Judaism, and this despite the fact that arguing from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ would seem at first glance to indicate an internal Jewish dispute - as Gallio may just have suggested in saying that Christians have merely contravened Jewish law (18.1). Thus in defence against an attack on proselytising Jews Luke now has three arguments: those who are becoming Christians are already Jews, so we cannot be proselytising them; those gentiles who are becoming Christians remain gentiles, so we cannot be proselytising them; Christianity is not Judaism, so we are not proselytising. Such an exhaustive use of all possible arguments would be typical of ancient rhetoric.

To conclude, the typifying digression which introduces Apollos provides an image of a Church which one way or another should not be accused of proselytising to Judaism, which should possibly not be too closely associated with Egypt and the southern shores of the Mediterranean but rather with the Greek cities of Achaea and Macedonia and

the provinces of Asia Minor, about which one might have been misinformed, the members of which are educated but modest.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. D. C. Earl, The Political Thought of Sallust, (Cambridge: University Press, 1961), p. 60.

2. Tacitus, Agricola, ed. R. M. Ogilvie and I. A. Richmond, (Oxford: University Press, 1967), p. 25.

3. F. W. Walbank, Polybius (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press/London: Cambridge University Press, 1972), pp. 46-47.

4. Walbank cites the following as examples: ix.22-26 (Hannibal); x.2-5 (Scipio Africanus); xxxi.22-30 (Aemilius Paullus and Scipio Aemilianus).

5. Alan Wardman, Plutarch's Lives, (London: Paul Elek, 1974), pp. 6-7.

6. George Kennedy, The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World (300 B.C. - 300 A.D.), (Princeton: University Press, 1972), p. 296.

7. Walsh, Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods, p. 28.

8. Syme, Ten Studies in Tacitus, p. 89.

9. Syme, Sallust, p. 65.

10. For the identity of the reference see Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, p. 552.

11. See e.g. E. Käsemann, "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus", in Essays on New Testament Themes, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1964), pp. 136-148.

12. Cf. the situation of the proselytes in the Pentecost crowd (2.10).

13. See Haenchen, op. cit., p. 419.

14. Cf. e.g. Jüngst as cited by J. Dupont, The Sources of Acts: The Present Position, (London: Darton, Longman and Tod, 1964), p. 34; B. S. Easton as cited by Haenchen, op. cit., p. 37; A. M. Perry, "Acts and the Roman Trial of Paul", Harvard Theological Review, 17 (1924), 195-196; A. A. Trites, "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts", Novum Testamentum, 16 (1974), 278-284; W. C. van Unnik, "'The Books of Acts' - The Confirmation of the Gospel", Novum Testamentum, 4 (1960), 26-59.

15. Acts 18.17. For this view see e.g. The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, (5 vols., London: Macmillan and Co., 1920-1933), vol. II, p. 177; Loisy and Goguel as cited by H. Conzelmann, The Theology of Saint Luke, (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), p. 137 n.1; J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, 2nd ed. revised and supplemented, (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), p. 178; D. W. Riddle, "The Occasion of Luke-Acts", Journal of Religion, 10 (1930), 545-562, p. 554.

16. Suetonius, Claudius, 25. For the interpretation see e.g. H. H. Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero, 3rd ed., (London: Methuen, 1970), p. 458 n.11; "It is possible to believe that Chrestus was an unknown Jewish agitator (which is what Suetonius himself may have thought, but he may not have fully understood his source), but the identification with Jesus Christ is much more reasonable. Knowledge of Christianity may have reached the Jewish community in Rome and led to internal dissensions: in that sense Christ will have been the cause of the trouble". Cf. Theodor Mommsen, The Provinces of the Roman Empire, trans. W. P. Dickson, 2 vols., (London: Richard Bently and Son, 1886), II, p. 199 n.1.

17. Even in the time of Caesar Mommsen speaks of him protecting the religion but not the nationality of the Jews, and of the Jews in Rome being denationalised (Theodor Mommsen, The History of Rome, (new ed., trans. W. P. Dickson, 5 vols. (London: Richard Bently and Son, 1894) V, pp. 417-419, 372). Elsewhere also he talks of Judaism being denationalised, and of it in its political representation being deleted from the commonwealth after 70 A.D., but in a footnote he accepts that the privileged position of the Jews in the Empire was based on their being a nation (The Provinces of the Roman Empire, II, pp. 167, 220, 226 n.1).

    If apparently technical Latin is to be used the description licita or illicita should be considered in connection with whether the various synagogue congregations should be regarded as collegia, and whether each congregation could be regarded as a juristic person in respect of holding property and legal liability. Theoretically this could have varied from province to province. Of the vast number of collegia that existed in the Empire, probably the great majority operated as technically illicita without any noticeable restriction on their function. See E. G. Hardy, Studies in Roman History, (London: Swan Sonnenschein/ New York: Macmillan, 1906), pp. 129-150; E. T. Merrill, Essays in Early Christian History, (London: Macmillan, 1924), pp. 43-53.

18. Jean Juster, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain: leur Condition Juridique, Economique et Social, 2 vols. (Paris: Libraire Paul Geutner, 1914), I, p. 213.

19. Quoted by Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, xix.5.2-3, § 290.

20. Juster, op. cit., I, p. 233.

21. Ibid., II, pp. 19-20; cf. E. T. Merrill on the position of the Jews after 70 A.D.: "Even the Roman jurists went on speaking of them as a nation, a people, a race, precisely as when they still formed a distinct political entity". (Essays in Early Christian History, p. 45).

22. On the irrelevance to the present discussion of the complications brought about by comparison with the case of Titus in Galatians, see p. 24 above.

23. Alexander White, Bible Characters, 6 vols., (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1901), CXXIII.

24. F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts: the English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, p. 381; Haenchen, op. cit., pp. 549-551; C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 2nd ed., (London: A. & C. Black, 1971), p. 43.

25. Caesar, 79.3.

26. C. J. Hemer, "Alexandria Troas", Tyndale Bulletin, 26 (1975), 79-112. Material on this town is largely derived from this article.

27. Deipnosophistae, 9.393d. At 4.155b Athenaeus uses the more extended form, "Ἡγησιάνακτα τὸν Ἀλεξανδρέα ἀπὸ Τρωάδος".

28. Acts 16.8, 11; 20.5,6.

29. Cf. Homer, Iliad, I.35-42.

30. Some sources (ℵ, Didymus, Ammonius) read Apelles. G. D. Kilpatrick argues for this reading on the grounds that Apollos is an assimilation to the much more famous figure of I Corinthians ("Apollos-Apelles", Journal of Biblical Literature, 89 (1970), 77). Haenchen, op. cit., p. 549 n.2 follows The Beginnings of Christianity ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, vol. IV, p. 232, in arguing that it is a learned attempt to identify this figure with the Apelles of Romans 16.10.

31. The case made by J. G. Griffiths, "Was Damaris an Egyptian?", Biblische Zeitschrift, 8 (1964), 293-295, is scarcely likely to have been clear enough to the ancient reader to merit consideration of her as a third example.

32. The inclusion of Cyrenians and Alexandrians amongst the opponents of Stephen (6.9) is clearly irrelevant here.

33. For the dominance of Cornelius over the whole of 9.32-10.48 see below Ch. V, E, pp. 119-123.

34. See below Ch. V, C, pp. 105-116.

35. See above, Ch. II, A(5), pp. 39-42.

36. The appeal to inexperience as an indication of a lack of craft frequently comes in the captatio benevolentiae of the prooemium, e.g. Lysias XIX.2: Demosthenes XLI.2, §1028; XLVIII.1, §1167. A single example may be quoted: "ὁ δὲ πατὴρ οὗτος (εἰρήσεται γάρ) ἅμα τῆς πενίας ἣν ὑμεῖς ἅπαντες ἴστε, καὶ τοῦ ἰδιώτης εἶναι φανερὰς ἔχων τὰς μαρτυρίας ἀγωνίξεται. Demosthenes XLIV.4, §1081.

37. See below pp. 112.

V

"The women came out singing and dancing,
with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of musick,
and answered one another as they played, and said,
Saul hath slain his thousands,
and David his ten thousands."

(I Samuel 18.6-7)

CHAPTER V

ΕΚΦΡΑΣΕΙΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΥ IN ΣΥΓΚΡΙΣΙΣ

The previous two chapters have considered the significance of character descriptions as individual units within the overall context of the book. While maintaining an interest in this wider context, attention in this chapter will be focussed on the more immediate context of those sketches which appear in groups and the implications that this has for their significance.

A. The Classical Background

The school exercise of σύγκρισις,[1] or comparison, which the schoolboy probably learned before that of description, is introduced by Theon in this way:

> "Σύγκρισίς ἐστι λόγος τὸ βέλτιον ἢ τὸ χεῖρον παριστάς. γίνονται δὲ συγκρίσεις προσώπων τε καὶ πραγμάτων, καὶ προσώπων μὲν οἷον Ἀΐαντος Ὀδυσσέως, πραγμάτων δὲ οἷον σοφίας τε καὶ ἀνδρείας. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῶν προσώπων θάτερον προκρίνομεν εἰς τὰς πράξεις ἀποβλέποντες, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο περὶ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἀγαθόν, μία μέθοδος ἂν εἴη περὶ ἀμφοῖν."
>
> (9.231/II.112.20-26)

In the dicanic genres the exercise would come into its own in comparing the accuser with the accused, or in drawing an analogy with a famous case, or with the actions of a famous person. Perhaps the most renowned comparisons, however, are the nineteen συγκρίσεις βίων preserved with the Parallel Lives of Plutarch, Luke's contemporary. First of all he writes, for example, a life of Agesilaus and then a separate life of Pompey. These are then followed by a

piece, a σύγκρισις , in which Plutarch treats of topics such as their rise to power, their subsequent treatment of their first patron, their breaches of justice, and so on in an orderly sequence, all the while alternating between the one figure and the other in order to compare them. This is interesting in the context of what Theon has to say about there being two types of σύγκρισις :

> "ἔστι δὲ ὁ τρόπος τῶν λόγων διττός· ἢ γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἑκάστου τῶν συγκρινομένων ἰδίᾳ τινὰ λόγον διεξελευσόμεθα, ἢ ἕνα παρ' ἀμφοῖν θατέρου προκρίνοντες..."
> (9.235/II.115.6-8)

What Plutarch is apparently doing is using both types of procedure for the same pair of people. First of all he exemplifies Theon's first type, providing a separate essay on each of the two subjects compared.[2] Then he exemplifies Theon's second type, offering one essay covering both subjects and indicating preferences, just as in the example cited by Theon himself of Xenophon's comparison in the Symposium (viii.6-41) of the love of the soul and of the body.

In historiography proper, examples of this second type of comparison may be found in Sallust, who offers συγκρίσεις προσώπων involving Cato and Caesar, Jugurtha and Micipsa, and Jugurtha and Metellus.[3] Also, in the work of Luke's probable contemporary, Tacitus, the obituary of Gaius Ateius Capito includes a comparison with Marcus Antistius Labeo,[4] and when Gnaeus Domitius Afer and Marcus Servilius Nonianus die in the same year they are similarly compared:

> "sequuntur uirorum inlustrium mortes, Domitii Afri et M. Seruilii, qui summis honoribus et multa eloquentia uiguerant, ille orando causas, Seruilius diu foro, mox tradendis rebus Romanis celebris et eloquentia uitae quam clariorem effecit, ut par ingenio, ita morum diuersus".[5]

Examples of the first type of comparison are, however, of more interest here, since it is this type that is found in Acts. A minor example from the doyen of Latin orators may first of all be considered:

> "Messalla consul est egregius, fortis, constans, diligens, nostri laudator, amator, imitator. ille alter uno uitio minus uitiosus quod iners, quod somni plenus, quod imperitus, quod ἀπρακτότατος, sed uoluntate ita καχέκτης ut Pompeium post illam contionem in qua ab eo senatus laudatus est odisse coeperit. itaque mirum in modum omnis a se bonos alienavit. neque id magis amicitia Clodi adductis fecit quam studio perditarum rerum atque partium".
>
> (Ad Atticum I.xiv.6)

Messalla and Piso are compared and contrasted first for their personal attributes - Messalla is all that is excellent, and Piso is damned in a deliberate, out and out, back-handed compliment, - and secondly in respect of their associates, Cicero with typical modesty citing himself as the best and thus providing a sharp contrast with Piso's friend Clodius, one of Cicero's most hated opponents. Noticeably Piso, whom Cicero does not even deign to name, is described at much greater length.[6]

Another example of a σύγκρισις or comparatio where the one who is worsted remains unnamed, despite receiving the fuller treatment, is found in the work of Cicero's contemporary, Catullus:

"salue, nec minimo puella naso
nec bello pede nec nigris ocellis
nec longis digitis nec ore sicco
nec sane nimis elegante lingua,
decoctoris amica Formiani.
ten prouincia narrat esse bellam?
tecum Lesbia nostra comparatur?
o saeclum insapiens et infacetum!"
(Carmen 43)

Physical appearance and associates - the writer again including himself - are on this occasion the basis for comparison, or rather for non-comparison. For, at the end of the day, Catullus denies that there is any ground for comparison. This accords with Theon's primary dictum:

"πρῶτον δὲ διωρίσθω, ὅτι αἱ συγκρίσεις γίνονται οὐ τῶν μεγάλην πρὸς ἄλληλα διαφορὰν ἐχόντων· γελοῖος γὰρ ὁ ἀπορῶν, πότερον ἀνδρειότερος Ἀχιλλεὺς ἢ Θερσίτης, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁμοίων, καὶ περὶ ὧν ἀμφισβητοῦμεν, πότερον δεῖ προτίθεσθαι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ὁρᾶν τοῦ ἑτέρου πρὸς τὸ ἕτερον ὑπεροχήν."
(9.232/II.112.26-113.2)

Granted that it is ridiculous to make a comparison where there is nothing to compare, nevertheless it is not unreasonable, while essentially accepting what Theon says, to treat as a little oversimplified his advice that there should be no obvious difference between the subjects under discussion. What is important, and what it may be assumed Theon is driving at, is that there must be a clear initial basis for comparison.

Hence it is that, in making his contrast, it is enough for Cicero that the two men are consuls. Tacitus (Annals III.30), primarily on the basis that the two men died in the same year, offers a contrast between a traditional republican career and a new-fangled imperial one - the latter, perhaps significantly, being given the more prolonged treatment. And Catullus can establish a basis for comparison simply by making

a more or less identical statement about two girls:

> "Quintia formosa est multis, mihi candida, longa
> recta est: haec ego sic singula confiteor.
> totum illud formosa nego: nam nulla uenustas,
> nulla in tam magno est corpore mica salis.
> Lesbia formosa est, quae cum pulcerrima tota est,
> tum omnibus una omnis surripuit Veneres".
> (Carmen 86)

This use of verbal reminiscence to highlight similarity or contrast is also discernible to some extent in one of the examples which Theon (11.240/II.118.15) gives of ἔκφρασις, one in which comparison is also involved:

> "εἶδος δὲ τῆς μὲν ἴβιος τόδε· μέλαινα δεινῶς πᾶσα, σκέλεα δὲ φοινίσσει γερανίου, πρόσωπον δὲ ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ἐπίγρυπον, μέγαθος δὲ ὅσον κρέξ. τῶν μὲν δὴ μελαινέων τῶν μαχομένων πρὸς τοὺς ὄφις ἥδε ἰδέη, τῶν δ' ἐν ποσὶ μᾶλλον εἱλεομένων τοῖσι ἀνθρώποισι (δίξαὶ γὰρ δή εἰσι ἴβιες) ἥδε· ψιλὴ τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὴν δειρὴν πᾶσαν, λευκὴ πτεροῖσι πλὴν κεφαλῆς καὶ [τοῦ] αὐχένος καὶ ἄκρων τῶν πτερύγων καὶ τοῦ πυγαίου ἄκρου (ταῦτα δὲ τὰ εἶπον πάντα μέλαινά ἐστι δεινῶς), σκέλεα δὲ καὶ πρόσωπον ἐμφερὴς τῇ ἑτέρῃ."

(Herodotus: Histories II.76)

To suggest that these almost necessarily repeated and contrasting words are pointers in the establishment of the comparison may seem very obvious. What the rhetoricians noticed and systematised often was. The basic principle is the same as that employed by Vergil in the often much more complex reflections and reminiscences he deploys in the type of literary comparison known to modern analysts as simile.[7]

To round off this sketch of the σύγκρισις as it appears in general literature, and in prospect of the way in which it appears in Acts, it may be recalled that Walbank regards the whole of Polybius' sixth book as a digression. That digression he describes as a σύγκρισις of Rome and Carthage.[8]

The point of departure for it is the battle of Cannae, the literal and not just the literary pitting of the one against the other.

B. Barnabas, and Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 4.32-5.11)

To turn now to Acts, the first comparative pairing to be considered is that of Joseph Barnabas with Ananias and Sapphira. As was observed in the consideration of digressions,[9] the description of one character may be given as representative and characteristic of a whole group. In the present case the σύγκρισις is intended to serve this purpose. This function is high-lighted stylistically by the way in which the language of the widely recognised summary is picked up in the descriptions of both Barnabas and Ananias. Acts 4.34b-35a reads:

> "ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον,
> πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων
> καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων·..."

This language is reflected in the following way. "κτήτορες .... ὑπῆρχον" (cf. "τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ" 4.32) is picked up by "ὑπάρχοντος αὐτῷ" in the case of Barnabas (4.37), and by "κτῆμα" in the case of Ananias (5.1). "πωλοῦντες" is reflected in "πωλήσας" in the former case and in "ἐπώλησεν" in the latter. "ἔφερον τὰς τιμάς" is paralleled by "ἤνεγκεν τὸ χρῆμα" in the first case, and contrasted with "ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς. . . . καὶ ἐνέγκας μέρος τι" in the second (5.2). Again, "καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων" is made a firm anchor by its virtual repetition in "καὶ ἔθηκεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων" (4.37) and

"παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔθηκεν" (5.2). Note should also be taken of "ἔπεσεν δὲ παραχρῆμα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξέψυξεν" (5.10), where this linguistic reminiscence helps to tie Sapphira in with the comparison and the summary, whereas the other linguistic parallels in the description of her case only serve to identify her with her husband. Similarity in phraseology, then, ties the summary to its illustration the σύγκρισις, and ties the two elements of the σύγκρισις, the two ἐκφράσεις, to each other.

Yet the artistry with which, by the use of uariatio, any repetitious crudity is avoided should not be missed. Besides omission from verbal reflection of some words in either or both elements of the σύγκρισις, different parts of the same verb or noun are used - ὑπῆρχον / ὑπάρχοντος, πωλοῦντες / πωλήσας / ἐπώλησεν, ἔφερον / ἤνεγκεν / ἐνέγκας, τὰς τιμὰς / τῆς τιμῆς - and different words from the same root - κτήτορες / κτῆμα. That such variation may reasonably be considered deliberate is confirmed by classical authors' studied use of the figure of polyptoton. This figure may be neatly illustrated from Livy's introductory sketch of Hannibal:

> ". . . . perfida plus quam Punica, nihil ueri, nihil sancti, nullus deum metus, nullum ius iurandum, nulla religio".
>
> (Ab Urbe Condita XXI.4)

Luke, of course, uses the variation for largely aesthetic reasons, with only a shadow of the sense of marked emphasis achieved by Livy's combining the figure with anaphora.[10] For the same reason he employs actual variation of

terminology, "ἀγροῦ" and "κτῆμα" corresponding to "χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν" (not necessarily implying that Ananias and Sapphira are involved in selling a house), and "τὸ χρῆμα" to "τὰς τιμάς". Finally, Luke also makes effective use of varied word order, placing "ἔθηκεν" after "παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων" in the case of Ananias, which variation is just sufficient psychologically to prepare the reader for the fact that this part of the comparison is not yet complete.

Identification of the literary character of this portion of the book may in itself be sufficient explanation of certain factors. Firstly, the description of Ananias together with Sapphira is longer than that of Barnabas in the same way as that of the worse of the pair is longer in the cases from classical literature discussed above. Secondly, Sapphira may be subordinated to Ananias not primarily for any social reason, but basically for the literary purpose of making the contrast one-to-one in the first instance, and hence clearer. Yet if she to any degree appears to bear the brunt of the blame, then such a <u>cherchez-la-femme</u> attitude was as old in historiographical writing as Herodotus' ideas about the causes of the war between Europe and Asia, and feminine influence was a typical motif in Hellenistic historiography.[11] Thirdly, Peter is a <u>uox et praeterea nihil</u> because it is not his character that is being treated as characteristic of the Church, but by way of contrast, that of Ananias and Sapphira. Peter is merely a dramatic means for the author to express

the element of judgment inherent in συγκρισις, and it is doubtful whether any personal asperity should be imputed to him.

As regards the positive implications of this section's literary character for its meaning and purpose, the point which makes the two figures comparable, and which is illustrative of the general situation, is of course that both sell property and put cash at the disposal of the community as a whole - an appeal to popular philosophical idealism.[12]

The point of contrast for which Ananias with his wife is condemned has not been found to be so clear. It has been assumed that it lies in their failure to share by keeping back some private property. Haenchen draws a comparison with the luckless Achan in the book of Joshua.[13] As has already been observed, however, the exercise of συγκρισις involves expression of judgment (Theon repeatedly uses the verb προκρίνειν), and Luke expresses his judgment by the standard historiographical practice of putting it in the mouth of one of his characters. The action of which Peter accuses Ananias both at the beginning and at the end of his short speech is expressed by the one verb - "ψευσάσθαι", "ἐψεύσω" (5.3,4). Falsehood is the charge, and it is this that is emphasised in the repeat scene with Sapphira, where it is clear from the interchange that she tells a lie and attests a false figure. Cadbury rightly speaks of "the famous liar Ananias".[14]

If further pointers are necessary, the matter of names

may be considered. As indicated earlier,[15] interpretation in this area may be possible because Ananias happens to have a notorious predecessor of the same name. Hananiah (the variation in the form of the name is due solely to traditional English rendering), who appears in Jeremiah chapter twenty-eight, is a false prophet who suffers the punishment of death:

> "καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει Σεδεκια βασιλέως Ἰουδα ἐν μηνὶ τῷ πέμπτῳ εἶπέν μοι Ἀνανιας υἱὸς Ἀξωρ ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης ὁ ἀπὸ Γαβων .... καὶ εἶπεν Ἱερεμιας Ἀληθῶς .... καὶ εἶπεν Ἱερεμιας τῷ Ἀνανια Οὐκ ἀπέσταλκέν σε κύριος, καὶ πεποιθέναι ἐποίησας τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ἐπ' ἀδίκῳ· διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω σε ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, τούτῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἀποθανῇ. καὶ ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἑβδόμῳ."
>
> (28.1,6,15-17 LXX)

Thus someone cognisant with this might see Ananias' falsehood as inherent in his very name.[16]

Again, this lying is said by Peter to be against God and the Holy Spirit. Herein may possibly lie a contrast with the overt etymologising of the nickname Barnabas as "υἱὸς παρακλήσεως". Later in Acts the Holy Spirit is closely associated with encouragement ("τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος" 9.31), and in John's gospel the Holy Spirit is the παράκλητος (Jn. 14.16-17; 15.26 etc.), τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. But if this contrast is intended, then it could only have been open to those with knowledge of ecclesiastical tradition, for it is not made sufficiently explicit in Acts itself.

Nevertheless, although this last point about names may not have been fully comprehensible to the general reader, what

would have been plain to any reader with even primary education was that the Church promoted communality and repudiated deceit.

That this whole section (4.32-5.11) should be seen as a digression allowing for the passage of time would seem to be reasonable. The author would wish to put some distance and offer some variety between his two stories of arrest and trial. Hence, as Sallust departs from and returns to the theme of consular elections,[17] so here Luke departs from and returns to the theme of arrest and trial, with Peter as the major figure in both cases. Another interesting tie-up between what precedes and what succeeds the digression is that, while the prayer for boldness is answered immediately - "δὸς τοῖς δούλοις σου μετὰ παρρησίας πάσης λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον σου" (4.29) is answered by "ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρρησίας" (4.31)- the section concerned with miracles is not answered till after the digression - "ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἐκτείνειν σε εἰς ἴασιν καὶ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι" (4.30) is answered by "διὰ δὲ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πολλά" (5.12). This division of the answer to the prayer tends to give an impression of a more compressed time scale, in contradiction to the impression of a more extended time scale given by the insertion of a digression. This contradiction is indicative of the fact that Luke is probably more interested in the aesthetic requirements of variety and of coherence and connection in the narrative, rather than in suggesting an accurate chronology.

C. Philip, Simon Magus, and the Ethiopian (Acts 8.4-40)

The second group of descriptions in Acts to be considered under the heading of σύγκρισις is that of Philip, Simon Magus, and the Ethiopian Eunuch. As in the previous case it is clear that it is intended to be illustrative of the situation of a whole group, in this case the situation of those of whom Luke says, "οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες διῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον".

The overall literary arrangement here is, however, much more complex than in the case just discussed.[18] Yet it is quite clear that to begin with there is a comparison of Philip and Simon. Since Philip has already appeared in the narrative at the election of the seven (6.1-6), there is here no introductory character description in the asyndetic style, only a description of his activities. To balance this, the introduction of Simon is also in a largely narrative form. Through these descriptive narratives it is made clear that it is reasonable to compare the two men. Firstly, they are in the same place - "Φίλιππος δὲ κατελθὼν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας" (8.5); "ἀνὴρ δέ τις ὀνόματι Σίμων προϋπῆρχεν ἐν τῇ πόλει μαγεύων καὶ ἐξιστάνων τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας" (8.9). Secondly, both have a message about someone, Philip about Christ ("ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν" - 8.5), and Simon about himself ("λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν" - 8.9). Thirdly, both attract the attention of great numbers of people - "προσεῖχον δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοὺς καὶ βλέπειν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει" (8.6); "ᾧ προσεῖχον πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου

λέγοντες· οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. προσεῖχον δὲ αὐτῷ διὰ τὸ ἱκανῷ χρόνῳ ταῖς μαγείαις ἐξεστακέναι αὐτούς (8.10-11).
And fourthly, having noticed that Simon caused amazement, we may note that Philip did also: "ὁ δὲ Σίμων..... προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ, θεωρῶν τε σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας γινομένας ἐξίστατο " (8.13).

It will have been observed that even as points of similarity are established so too are points of contrast. Philip proclaims another: Simon proclaims himself. People come to hear Philip and to see what he does, but to greet Simon only for what he has done, for he is not portrayed as having any substantial message. Philip generates joy, Simon astonishment, and only he reacts to Philip as people reacted to him. Then, of course, Simon is converted by Philip and not vice versa.

Similarities and differences having been established, it remains for the author to judge between the two characters. As in the previous example, Luke expresses his judgment in dramatic form, again introducing Peter for the purpose. Again the judgment is included in the longer, second description of the worse character. And also as in the previous case, it is attitude to the Holy Spirit that is crucial. It is treated by Simon as a purchasable authority - presumably a piece of magic that can be taught, and such as he himself used to perform. For this he is condemned. Luke is seeking to establish that Christianity is not mere magic, and indeed that it is

opposed to it. That such argumentation was apposite may be illustrated from Juvenal who, in the midst of decrying a motley procession of devotees of the mystery religions, fortunetellers, astrologers and diviners, introduces a Jewess in this way:

> "cum dedit ille locum, cophino faenoque relicto
> arcanam Iudaea tremens mendicat in aurem,
> interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos
> arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli.
> implet et illa manum, sed parcius; aere minuto
> qualiacumque uoles Iudaei somnia uendunt".
> (Satire VI. 542-7)

Once Luke has portrayed his characters and judged between them it is unnecessary for him to give any clear picture of Simon's fate. The literary form is already complete. It is complete also without any reference to Philip's attitude to the Spirit, for it is implicit that he accepts his inability to impart it. There may be a hint that he continues modestly contented in this condition in the fact that, just as because of his presence "ἐγένετο δὲ πολλὴ χαρὰ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ " (8.8), so the Eunuch "ἐπορεύετο .... τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων" (8.39).[19] If this is so, it would imply exactly the opposite of the suggestion that "χαίρων" indicates that the Eunuch received the Spirit.[20] This leads to consideration of the relationship of the portrayal of the Eunuch to the σύγκρισις of Philip and Simon.

The characterisation of the Eunuch is a most interesting study in itself. Lowther Clarke[21] noted connections between this passage and the prophecy of Zephaniah, the main points being that Zephaniah (2.4, cf. Acts 8.26,40) mentions Ἄζωτος, μεσημβρίας , and Γάζα, and also (2.11, cf. Acts 8.27) προσκυνήσουσιν and Αἰθιόπες . Haenchen remarks that "II Kings 2 has

several points of similarity with the passage under discussion, e.g. 1) its verse 11 speaks of a ἅρμα; 2) its οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἔτι (v. 12) corresponds verbatim to our 8.39; 3) εὑρέθη (8.40) recalls οὐχ εὗρον αὐτόν (v.17); 4) cf. ἦρεν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα κυρίου (v.16) and πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον (8.39)".[22]

These in fact are not the only examples that could be cited of the very strong connection both verbal and in thought between the two passages. It might also be noted that "αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος" (8.26), may well relate to "ἐν ἐρήμῳ" in II Kings 2.8, with Luke transmuting the meaning due to his conception of the proximity of the Jordan and the desert.[23] With "καθίσαι σὺν αὐτῷ" (8.31) compare "κάθου δὴ ὧδε" (II Kings 2.6). With "καὶ κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι" (8.38) compare "καὶ διέβησαν ἀμφότεροι" (II Kings 2.8). And, with so much verbal contact already established, it should be noted that "καὶ ἰδού" (v. 27; II Kings 2.11), the verb πορεύομαι (vv. 27,36; II Kings 2.6), and "ὕδωρ" (v.36; II Kings 2.6,8), all of which on their own would be insignificant, are further details which the two passages have in common.

Parallels should not, however, be restricted to the second chapter of II Kings, but should also include the first:

> "καὶ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐλάλησεν πρὸς Ἠλιου τὸν Θεσβίτην λέγων Ἀναστὰς δεῦρο .... καὶ ἐπορεύθη Ἠλιου."
> (II Kings 1.3-4 LXX)

> "καὶ ἐλάλησεν ἄγγελος κυρίου πρὸς Ἠλιου καὶ εἶπεν Καταβηθι μετ' αὐτοῦ .... καὶ ἀνέστη Ἠλιου καὶ κατέβη."
> (II Kings 1.15 LXX)

The comparison with Acts is striking:

> "Ἄγγελος δὲ κυρίου ἐλάλησεν πρὸς Φίλιππον λέγων· ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου κατὰ μεσημβρίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ εἰς Γάζαν ... καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη." (Acts 8.26-27)

Unfortunately some significant textual difficulty is involved. In the case of the LXX the text given above is that of Rahlfs who follows V. But at verses 3-4 the A text reads:

> "Καὶ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐκάλεσεν Ἠλιου τὸν Θεσβίτην λέγων Ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύθητι ...."

The second complication is that in Acts some texts - p^{50}, D,181 - read "ἀναστάς" instead of "ἀνάστηθι ", and some - p^{50}, C,D - "πορεύθητι" instead of "πορεύου". Now, clearly it would not be proper to manipulate the text by making such an eclectic choice of readings as would produce the closest match between Kings and Acts. But equally clearly, no matter which readings are preferred, the parallel remains striking.

Taking into account, then, both the first and second chapters of II Kings, the following further correspondences may be observed. In terms of the general pattern of the story we may notice, firstly, that untoward events take place in Samaria, and, secondly, that as Elijah waylays a king's emissaries so Philip accosts a member of a queen's court. Thirdly, Ekron and Gaza, the respective destinations of these travellers, are both in the Philistian plain. Fourthly, journeying, meeting a prophet, holding conversation, and going into/through water is the sequence

of both passages. Fifthly, the idea of the people/person encountered returning whence they/he came is in both passages - "ἦν δὲ ὑποστρέφων" (8.28) and "καὶ ἐπεστρώφησαν" (II Kings 1.5), Sixthly, and without any recourse to the assumption of Elijah, the idea of the physical transportation of a prophetic figure is present in both passages. For an Old Testament parallel to the language of Acts in this respect, comparison may be made with I Kings 18.12: "καὶ πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἀρεῖ σε εἰς γῆν, ἣν οὐκ οἶδα".

When account is taken of the material that the above analysis has shown could be derived from the LXX, the asyndetic introductory portion of the ἔκφρασις προσώπου, the dialogue introducing the quotation from Isaiah, and the rounding off in v. 40 which refers back to v. 25, practically the whole of Acts 8.26-40 has been covered. None of this dismemberment, however, is particularly illuminating unless one can explain why Luke put it together in the form in which we find it.

To elucidate the pattern of the passage it will be useful to consider Lucian's dialogue Εἰκόνες. This is essentially an essay on how to describe someone. It takes the form of a friend having to describe a lady he has seen in order that Lucian may identify her to him. Lucian starts with the general effect of her physical appearance. In Acts the words "Αἰθίοψ, εὐνοῦχος" constitute, as we saw above,[24] one of the relatively rare occasions on which something of a person's physical appearance would spring before the reader's eye. From physical appearance Lucian

goes on to imply the lady's social status and place of origin from the group that accompanies her - "καὶ εὐνοῦχων τι πλῆθος καὶ ἁβραὶ πάνυ πολλαί". And it is the later addition of soldiers to this company that finally identifies her as the emperor's mistress. The Eunuch's social status and place of origin are simply but clearly stated by Luke. After returning to the praise of the woman's appearance by comparing her with painting and sculpture, Lucian goes on to describe what she is doing as she walks along:

> "βιβλίον ἐν ταῖν χεροῖν εἶχεν εἰς δύο συνειλημένον καὶ ἐῴκει τὸ μέν τι ἀναγινώσκεσθαι αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἤδη ἀνεγνωκέναι. μεταξὺ δὲ προϊοῦσα διελέγετο τῶν παρομαρτούντων τινὶ οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι· οὐ γὰρ ἐς ἐπήκοον ἐφθέγγετο."
>
> (43.9)

This resembles very closely the picture of reading and conversation which Luke paints in Acts, and it is interesting that the phrase "καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅρματος αὐτοῦ" which precedes it is in fact a brief reversion to the theme of physical description, as well as perhaps implying elevated social status. All in all, it is clear that Luke arranges the whole of the material in Acts 8.26-40 in order to provide a full length portrait of the Ethiopian.

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that, although Lucian says that he can almost see and hear the woman from his friend Lycinas' description,[25] he yet maintains that this is not enough. Praise of physical appearance is of no use without portrayal and praise of the good points of the soul, "τὸ ἥμερον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον καὶ τὸ μεγαλόφρον καὶ σωφροσύνην καὶ παιδείαν" (43.11). No doubt Lycinas was

disappointed that he could not overhear what was read and what was said in conversation precisely because thus would the 'soul' of the lady have been made known to him. It is by allowing his audience to overhear the conversation and the reading that Luke elucidates the character of the Eunuch.

What then is his character? Perhaps most surprising for the modern reader is that he must take it to be illuminated by the passage that the Ethiopian is reading from Isaiah. The modern churchman's association of this passage with Christ is so complete that to see it as in any way descriptive of the character of the Eunuch is at first strange. Yet the literary form of the passage demands this. Humility is ascribed to the Ethiopian no less than to Jesus. This humility is also seen in his willingness to admit his ignorance and ask for help and commentary on what he is reading. Later in Acts, but in a passage which has already been discussed, it would not be unreasonable to see this theme as picked up again in Apollos' readiness to be put right (18.24). Of a lack of pride despite one's station Lucian says, "ταύτην ἄν τις μάλιστα ἐπαινέσειε". (43.21)

One final lesson that may be gleaned from this dialogue of Lucian's is that the whole conceit of its form, whereby the interchange sets out to identify the lady, to name her, implies that in a straightforward description the name would come very near the beginning. This, as was noted in discussing the form and content of the character description,[26] is precisely Luke's practice.

This comparison with Lucian has shown that the ancient reader is unlikely to have shared Dibelius' view[27] that 8.26-39 is "told in the genuine style of legend and on the whole without literary embellishment". Although such a reader would have been unlikely to know the LXX, the influence which it apparently had will have made its own contribution to creating in the passage that carefully contrived numinous atmosphere, appropriate to the exotic subject of the Eunuch, that he will have sensed. Thus will he also have valued the element of secrecy on which Dibelius remarks. Dibelius attributes the lack of a sermon in the literary manner to the legendary quality he detects, but the reader would not think to expect more than an indication of the theme since a long harangue addressed to the Eunuch would scarcely illuminate his character. On the other hand, what he chooses to read does, and hence serves a personal interest rather than a devotional one as Dibelius suggests.

To return to consideration of how the characterisation of the Ethiopian relates to the σύγκρισις of Philip and Simon: the connection between the joy of the people in Samaria and the joy of the Eunuch, and the similarity between verses 25 and 40 have already been noted. Through these points the end of the description of the Eunuch is reminiscent of the foregoing comparison, the point of which is that the two men are compared as religious leaders and teachers. Simon, however, does not remain a leader. He becomes a disciple. Hence he is also in a position to be compared with another

disciple. This is the purpose of following the description of him with that of the Eunuch.

Both are exotic figures.[28] Both are Philip's converts. Both move in high social circles.[29] Simon, however, is full of himself and the Ethiopian is modest. Simon goggles at miracles, while the Ethiopian needs only the elucidation of scripture. The latter can clearly be trusted to know how to handle wealth, but Simon thinks that money can be used to buy even the Holy Spirit. The Eunuch journeys on transported by the joy of his conversion; Simon is dissatisfied, and greedy for an authority which even the man who converted him does not have. Simon finishes up in a desperate situation which contrasts sharply with the Ethiopian's joyful one - it is only this difference which makes the abrupt departure of Peter seem harsh where Philip's transportation does not appear so.

Linguistically, this comparison and contrast of Magus and the Eunuch may not be particularly pointed. Nevertheless, it may reasonably be maintained that the ancient reader's education would have tended to lead him to approach this section of Acts in a way very similar to that which has been described. The more so because, when this section is seen as three ἐκφράσεις brought together in complex σύγκρισις, it becomes clear that as a whole it constitutes a prosopographical digression which allows the reader to sense that some time has elapsed between Saul's beginning his persecution and his conversion. Again, if this section is in some sense a digression, that provides a sufficient literary explanation as to why it is never made

absolutely clear that the Eunuch is a gentile convert. Such a major advance in the narrative could not be made during a digression. There is, therefore, no need to resort to imaginary ecclesiastical politics to find Luke's motivation in this respect. It may, of course, still be maintained that this conversion is a literary and psychological preparation for the conversion of Cornelius, and that the conversion of the opponent Simon is a similar preparation for the conversion of the persecutor Saul.

The major objection to seeing this section as a digression is that it describes one of the advances signalled in the prologue:

> "καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἔν τε Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς." (1.8)

Belonging as it does to the prologue, this programme has been treated with proper seriousness. Yet that seriousness should not allow the reader to expect too precise a carrying out of the programme. For although he has heard of teaching in Jerusalem, it cannot be said that he has heard anything of a mission throughout Judaea before coming to this section on Samaria. At 9.31 Luke is about to mention the Galilee, which is not named in the programme of chapter one. Neither, indeed, are any of the parts of Asia Minor, nor even Greece itself. Under these circumstances, and since historiographical digressions, as has already been remarked, are not intended to be virtually irrelevant to the progress of the narrative, but rather to provide a

background against which the subsequent narrative is more comprehensible, it may be allowed that 8.4-40 is an important illustrative digression. It is intended to advance the reader's understanding of the nature and destiny of the Church.

D. Paul, the Egyptian, and the Tribune (Acts 21.37-9, 22.25-8)

Before leaving off consideration of comparison and contrast as a mode of interpretation, a couple of occasions on which Paul is characterised by contrast with another may be noted. The first is when he has to introduce himself to the tribune with the words, "ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος μέν εἰμι Ἰουδαῖος, Ταρσεύς, τῆς Κιλικίας οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης" (21.39).[30] That is all the direct characterisation offered of him at this point, but he is also significantly characterised by being set in deliberate contrast with "ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων" (v. 38). Paul (and by implication other Christians) is no guerilla or assassin with eremitic tendencies.[31] As a Greek-speaking citizen of a timocracy he clearly stood higher up the scale of social approbation than if he had been an Egyptian.

The second occasion on which Paul is characterised by contrast with another is when he has further intercourse with the same tribune:

> "προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ χιλίαρχος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· λέγε μοι, σὺ Ῥωμαῖος εἶ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· ναί. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ χιλίαρχος· ἐγὼ πολλοῦ κεφαλαίου τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην ἐκτησάμην. ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔφη· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι."
> (22.27-28)

Paul or his family may have been wealthy enough to buy citizenship of Tarsus, but he is made in some sense superior to a tribune by having his Roman citizenship as a birthright.

There are reasons for supposing that these two contrasts, designed to illuminate Paul's character, are to be closely linked. Both, of course, centre on the topic of citizenship. More striking, however, is the suggestion that one could buy Roman citizenship. Officially speaking this was impossible, although bribery was no doubt effective at times. Haenchen, noting that Preuschen suggests the reign of Claudius as a time when the emperor's consort and courtiers made money by accepting bribes in this connection, remarks: "But it is very questionable whether Luke knew anything at all about the tribune's citizenship, and did not merely want by this statement to emphasise Paul's inherited citizenship".[32] Yet why should the concept of buying citizenship be entertained at all at this juncture? It is understandable if one still has in mind, not only Paul's Roman citizenship, but also his citizenship of Tarsus.

Dio Chrysostom, speaking in Tarsus c. 112 A.D., questioned the city's practice of selling citizenship for five hundred drachmas.[33] Tarsus was, as has been said, a timocracy, and in this connection, having stated that formal restriction of citizen rights to a limited section of the population was unusual in a Greek city, Jones remarks:

> "At Tarsus a fee of 500 drachmae was required for the exercise of political rights, and as a result the great mass of the industrial proletariat who worked in the linen mills were in effect disfranchised. This seems, however, to have been a local rule and perhaps of pre-Roman origin."[34]

Now, there is no question that Tarsus was indeed a famous city. Thus, if it had an unusual constitution, it is all the more likely that its general nature would have been widely known. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that a reader, on hearing talk of the purchase of citizenship in 22.28, would cast his mind back to 21.39. And if it is accepted that the author intends him to do this, then by stretching a point about the nature of Roman citizenship in order to bring it into closer connection with that of Tarsus, Luke is able to develop an argument about the worthiness of Paul. He is to be esteemed, as has been seen, for his citizenship of Tarsus and for the affluence that it implies. Roman citizenship is, however, obviously more estimable, and in Paul's case the more so because it is hereditary. Affluence is praiseworthy, but heredity and tradition and establishment even more so. Overall things Egyptian are of little account, things Greek are good, but politically things Roman are finest of all.

When these passages about Paul's two types of citizenship are brought into contact, such implied values begin to emerge. Later, during consideration of the ἀπολογία or defence speech,[35] reinforcement of the proposition that these two passages belong together will be found. Further confirmation of the at first surprising suggestion that Luke

found wealth a matter for approbation will also come to light.

E. Aeneas, Tabitha, and Cornelius (Acts 9.32-10.48)

Finally in this consideration of groups of character descriptions, it is worth emphasising that, where descriptions come in close succession, they are not necessarily part of a genuine σύγκρισις . Aeneas, Dorcas, and Cornelius are introduced in quick succession. But Luke is aiming at a cumulative, not a balanced effect. The three sketches form an ascending triad, an arrangement which might be described as an expanded version of an ascending tricolon, which was a very popular figure in Luke's time. Such a build-up is appropriate to one of the major turning points in the narrative. It is, of course, the constant presence of Peter that principally holds together the three elements of the triad, but it is interesting to note also that the command "ἀνάστηθι !" occurs at a crucial point in each element (9.34,40; 10.26). Movement, however, is the principal implication of this figure. It implies that the movement from Aeneas to Tabitha to Cornelius is a progression up the social scale, and it is not hard to accept that the lady would come somewhere between a penniless beggar and a centurion. It implies that healing, physical resuscitation, and conversion to the faith constitute an ascending progression. And it implies a value judgment in the fact that Luke begins with someone described purely in terms of his physical

condition, goes on from this person who was chronically sick to someone who had a terminal condition, whose spiritual status as a μαθήτρια is lightly touched on, and whose high moral rectitude is emphasised, and concludes with someone whose physical condition passes without comment but whose moral rectitude is mentioned and rectitude of religious intention emphasised. The implied scale of values would appear to be that the religious is more important than the moral, and the moral than the physical.

In terms of the shape of Acts as a whole, this passage relates to the digressions in the following ways. Firstly, it follows and illustrates a general statement about the Church:

> "ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας εἶχεν εἰρήνην οἰκοδομουμένη καὶ πορευομένη τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπληθύνετο." (9.31)

Secondly, the dominant case of Cornelius provides a backdrop against which the subsequent narrative, particularly in respect of the Church's relationship with gentiles, is more comprehensible. No doubt sequential narrative also performs this function, but the repetition of this story at 15.7-11 shows up the extent to which, although it is apparently about the activity of Peter, it is in fact explanatory of the dominating career of Paul. Thirdly, this passage is preceded by a reference to Saul's being packed off to Tarsus (9.30), and succeeded by a reference to Barnabas fetching him thence (11.25). Hence it allows

for the passage of time during a period of Paul's career which remains undescribed.

There is, of course, another chronological cross-reference at 11.9 in the allusion to the persecution connected with the death of Stephen. This takes the reader back to 8.1, and suggests that the preaching to the gentiles in Antioch took place at the same time as Philip was accosting the Samaritans, and as Saul was being accosted by the Risen Lord. Barnabas's mission to these Antiocheans, however, must be seen as synchronous with Peter's activity in the Philistian plain, for he cannot have left for Antioch before he had introduced Saul to the Jerusalem congregation (9.27). In 11.19-24 enough is said to reinforce the impression that the expansion under persecution as described in the triple συγκρισις involving Philip is indeed only illustrative of a wider movement, and that the period of consolidation in more quiescent times is also only illustrated by Peter's work. It is not made clear whether the gentile conversions in Antioch came before or after the conversion of Cornelius, but it is certain that the ordinary ancient reader would not have had any inhibition about Luke allowing that Cornelius was not the first gentile convert. He would have appreciated that what was important about that conversion was not that it was initial, but that it was normative, and thus for reasons of logical clarity and aesthetics had to be described first, whether or not it was chronologically prior. Further, the placing of the

activity in Antioch after the activity of Peter is another way in which the work is structured around a fluent account of Paul's career. For while the whole of 9.31-11.25 allows for his stay in Tarsus, it is the placing of the Antioch scene second which allows for his smooth reintroduction into the narrative.[36]

This ordering of the narrative to suit the career of Paul is indeed typical of Acts. It has been remarked how 8.4-40 allows for the period of Saul's persecution of the Church,[37] without describing it in such a way as to imprint an indelible and negative image of the man on the reader's imagination. From 9.1-30 there is narrative directly about Saul, about his conversion. After the section under consideration which allows for the period of his stay in Tarsus, from 11.25-30 the scene is again one in which Saul is an actor. 12.1-24 is about the situation in Jerusalem and thereabout. It is flanked by references (11.30, 12.25) to Saul and Barnabas being sent to and returning from Jerusalem. Their actual visit, however, is not described, and hence 12.1-24 is another passage allowing for the time taken up by undescribed events in the career of Paul, in this case there being the further aesthetic advantage of a geographical link. From 12.25-18.23 the narrative is about Paul, a point which is emphasised by the fact that when, at the end of chapter fifteen, he separates from Barnabas, the narrative stays with Paul. 18.24-28 is taken up with the relieving digression on Apollos which has already been discussed.[38] From then on till the end of the book the

narrative is about Paul. Thus, from his first appearance at 7.58, any passage which is not directly about Paul is yet fitted into the framework of his career, filling out periods in his life which for some reason Luke does not describe. Indeed, although it may be that, in terms of individual narrative units, Dibelius is correct to say that Saul is artfully introduced by Luke into the story of the martyrdom of Stephen,[39] in terms of the book of Acts as a whole, it is more true to say that he fits the story of Stephen to the career of Paul. Thus from chapter six the book revolves around Paul's career, and there can be no question of the rather episodic treatment of Peter being intended to provide any kind of real counter-balance to it. Paul dominates. The rest, even the great story of the conversion of Cornelius, is essentially either introduction or background to his career, pointing the ancient reader to him as the human individual through whom to interpret this history.

Summary and Conclusion

Beginning at the bottom of Luke's scale of physical, moral and religious matters, it may be observed that the attitude which places Aeneas at the bottom end of the scale finds further expression in the rejection of magical practices with their necessary concomitant of physical prodigies. Further, as well as being obviously very much a moral matter, the whole attitude to money and wealth ties in with this depreciation of the physical or material. Although it is quite acceptable to buy citizenship, it is

decidedly preferable not to need to descend to such pecuniary transactions. While vagrant criminals and beggars whose basic concern is the acquisition of money are at the bottom of the social ladder, the lady and the centurion who are wealthy enough to be giving it away are clearly their superiors. In the matter of the social idealism of giving to each according to his need, it is the givers not the receivers who are to be praised, as is openly and emphatically stated later in the book: "μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν" (20.35). Further, in the matter of giving, it may be surmised that the giving of money comes at the bottom of the list since it is better for Peter to give even physical health (3.6). These are all values to which only the well-off can effectively aspire. Hence it is not surprising that the characteristic figure of Paul is portrayed as coming from an affluent family. What prevents the affluent from being materialistic is that they are able to handle money. The affluent Eunuch with his carriage and his books would forfeit all esteem were he, like Simon, to imagine that religious affairs could be made subject to financial persuasion, or were he not trustworthy. Indeed, it is interesting that the dishonesty of Ananias and Sapphira is exposed precisely in a situation of financial transaction, for as Simon fails properly to value the religious, so they fail to place moral values above pecuniary consideration for their own physical security.

In terms of moral and social values, besides the high

estimation of truthfulness and generosity, there is also emphasis on modesty. The immodesty of Simon Magus' self-proclamation is rejected in favour of the modesty of both Philip and the Ethiopian, who openly admits his ignorance and seeks instruction. As noted in the last chapter, similar commendable behaviour is described in the later case of Apollos,[40] who further resembles the Ethiopian with his books in that both appear to be educated. A third point noted in the last chapter which receives reinforcement in this is the preference for the northern over the southern shore of the eastern Mediterranean, for the Tribune displays a decided preference for a Greek-speaking Tarsean over an Egyptian, and a place of prominence is accorded to Roman citizen Cornelius, not to say Paul. This accords broadly with the appreciative interest in elevated social connections evinced elsewhere in Acts, as in Paul's conversion of the proconsul of Cyprus (13.12), or of an Areopagite (17.34), or in his good relations with the Asiarchs (19.31), or with the chief man of Malta (28.7). This interest may even be exemplified in the Eunuch's association with a queen. Although his inclusion in the company of the followers of Jesus may at first sight make him appear an oddity, even this accords with traditional attitudes, for Theophrastus epitomises the man of petty ambition as wishing to be seen with a black slave,[41] and the <u>auctor ad Herennium</u> speaks of having an Ethiopian attendant as a way of pretending to be rich.[42] These somewhat pejorative remarks have no force if including,

rather than flaunting, an Ethiopian in one's entourage was not a real sign of status and distinction. It is as if Luke is giving the Church that genuine social asset. It may be that his being a eunuch has similar value since Lucian's esteemed lady is accompanied by a crowd of them.[43] On the other hand, the combination in Luke's attitude to women of a pejorative view of Sapphira and a romantic interest in the attractive Tabitha is probably not so much pointed and argumentative as simply typical of his society.

Apart from the rejection of magic, this chapter has added little to the understanding of the religious element in the apologetic. Rather it has confirmed the major interest in moral and social values suggested by the initial survey of the content of the character sketches. Further, if it is accepted that the preferences expressed appeal to respectable values in Romano-Hellenistic society, then it becomes clear that the apologetic element in Acts is more broadly based than on an occasional insistence on the law-abiding behaviour of the Church. It is not possible, for example, to agree with van Unnik's view that the Ananias and Sapphira interlude does not contribute to the apologetic.[44]

Finally, through the combined consideration of digressions and comparisons, it has become clear that the book is structured around the career of Paul. This reinforces the conclusion, drawn from his receiving not introductory but valedictory characterisation, that the presentation of Paul is the key to the whole.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. See Friederich Focke, "Synkrisis", Hermes, 58 (1923), 327-368, for a broad consideration of the theory and practice of σύγκρισις , and in particular its connection with the ἀγών, and its role in encomium, literary criticism, and historiography.

2. Cf. Wardman, Plutarch's Lives, p. 3, who says, "The comparative assessment is in principle an integral part of the Plutarchan biography, and translations which omit them [the συγκρίσεις] are, in effect, depriving the reader of an essential part of any given life", and goes on to imply that the principle holds even where the 'comparison' is not available.

3. Catilina liv; Bellum Jugurthinum vi. 2; lii.

4. Annals III. 75; cf. the eulogistic comparison of Germanicus with Alexander (Annals II.73).

5. Annals XIV.19. For precedent for the comparison of men at the time of their death cf. Thucydides I.126-138, where the culminations of the careers of Pausanias and Themistocles, both men under suspicion of collaboration with the Persians, are successively recounted and jointly concluded: "τὰ μὲν κατὰ Παυσανίαν τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα τὸν Ἀθηναῖον, λαμπροτάτους γενομένους τῶν καθ' ἑαυτοὺς Ἑλλήνων, οὕτως ἐτελεύτησεν."

6. Cf. Cicero, De Officiis, I.26,90 (on Alexander and Philip), and Ad Atticum, XII.40.2 (on Caesar and Alexander).

7. See D. A. West, "Multiple Correspondence Similes in the Aeneid", Journal of Roman Studies, 59 (1969), 40-49.

8. See above, p. 70 ; Walbank, Polybius, Ch. V.

9. See above, p. 74.

10. Ancient writers could have looked to the earlier Greek poets for models of the use of polyptoton, e.g. (1) Anacreon: "Κλεοβούλου μὲν ἔγωγ' ἐρέω, / Κλεοβούλῳ δ' ἐπιμαίνομαι, / Κλεόβουλον δὲ διοσκέω (Poetae Melici Graeci, ed. D. Page (Oxford: University Press, (1962), no. 359), where the repetition in anaphora of the name of the beloved in different cases speaks of the doting lover toying with the name of his beloved; (2) Aeschylus: "φρυκτὸς δὲ φρυκτὸν δέξῳ' ἀπ' ἀγγάρου πυρός / ἔπεμπεν . . . " where the repetition is suggestive of the continuity, and the change of case of the progression of the beacon signal, or "νῦν δ' εἰ προτέρων αἷμ' ἀποτείσῃ / καὶ τοῖσι θανοῦσι θανὼν ἄλλων / ποινὰς θανάτων ἐπικράνῃ. . . " where the terrible preoccupation with death focuses the attention in anticipation of the imminent murder of Agamemnon (Agamemnon 282-3, 1338-40).

10. contd. The use of the figure in Lucretius is discussed by West, The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius, pp. 119-120. From the N.T., comparison might be made with e.g. (1) Paul's emphasis on judgment at Romans 2.1 (cf. Matthew 7.1-2), or his emphasis on παράκλησις at II Corinthians 1.3-7; (2) the emphasis in Ephesians on blessing (1.3), and on oneness, calling, and universality (4.4-6). See also Acts 24.3 and Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, ad loc.

11. Cf. Walbank, Polybius, p. 163, and Walsh, Livy: His Historical Aims and methods, pp. 24, 212-216. For a comparison with Jewish tradition, mention need only be made of Eve.

12. Cf. e.g. Aristotle, Ethica Nicomachea, VIII. 14,1163a-b (by the turn of the eras the Peripatetics were not sharply distinguished doctrinally from either the Academics or the Stoics), and see Haenchen, op. cit., p. 233.

13. Joshua 7.1-26 (LXX). The verb νοσφίζομαι occurs both there (v.1) and in Acts (5.2).

14. H. J. Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955), p. 98.

15. See above Ch. II B(1), pp. 49-50.

16. The general principle of near instant death and burial for a false prophet may be observed in I Kings 13 where one prophet lies, the other disobeys and the consequence is death. It is interesting to note that other features of this story are sharing among prophets, the power of the prophetic word to bring death, a role for younger men in effecting burial, and the burial of two together; cf. also Deut. 18.20.

17. See above p. 73.

18. For the use of multiple comparison in historiography see Walsh, Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods, p. 86, on Fabius being successively compared with Minucius, Marcellus, and Scipio Africanus.

19. For joy as the proper response to conversion cf. Acts 16.34.

20. For this view see G. W. H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers, (London: Longmans, Green, 1951), pp. 65,67; G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke", in Studies in the Gospels - Essays in memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D.E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), p. 198.

21. The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, vol. II, p. 101.

22. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 313 n.2.

23. For this aspect of Luke's geography see H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), p. 18.

24. Ch. II B(4), p. 52.

25. For this as a virtue of ἔκφρασις, cf. Theon as quoted above on p. 42.

26. See above Ch. II B(1), p. 46.

27. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 15.

28. On the Eunuch see further pp. 125-126 below.

29. Cf. vv. 10,27.

30. The word πολίτης implies full citizenship. Since Luke gives no indication to the contrary, we must so understand it. A hypothesis as to how this could be possible for a Jew in a Greek city is offered by Sir William Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), pp. 173-80; cf. his St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, 10th ed., (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), pp. 31-32.

31. Cf. Haenchen, op. cit., p. 622.

32. Ibid., p. 634 n.2.

33. Oratio XXXIV.21-23.

34. A. H. M. Jones, The Greek City State from Alexander to Justinian, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 174, cf. F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire, (Princeton: University Press, 1926), p. 139 n.6; Sir William Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, pp. 224-228, who dates the constitution to the reform of Athenodorus in c.15 B.C. and describes Paul as having inherited a "privileged and aristocratic position".

35. See below Ch. VII.

36. Factors contributing to the fluency of the transition are both personal, Paul having been associated with Barnabas when he was last mentioned (9.27), and geographical, due to the relative proximity of Tarsus and Antioch, which were probably both in the Province of Syria from c. 44 B.C. till 72 A. D. when Vespasian constituted the province of Cilicia with Tarsus as its capital.

37. See above pp. 74, 114-116.

38. See above pp. 73-88.

39. Dibelius, op. cit., pp. 10, 207; cf. Haenchen, op. cit., pp. 82-83, 293, 296-297.

40. See above, pp. 86, 112 , cf. Luke 7.1-10 (Mat. 8.5-13). In Luke's version of the story not only is the centurion too modest to allow Jesus to enter his house, he is too modest to approach him personally (which is not to deny that the use of messengers conveniently illustrates the principle enunciated in v.8).

41. Characters, 21.4.

42. IV.1.63.

43. See above p. 111.

44. W. C. van Unnik, "'The Book of Acts' - The Confirmation of the Gospel", Novum Testamentum, 4 (1960), 26-59, p.40.

VI

Then farewell, Horace; whom I hated so,
Not for thy faults, but mine; it is a curse
To understand, not feel thy lyric flow,
To comprehend, but never love thy verse:
Although no deeper Moralist rehearse
Our little life, nor Bard prescribe his art,
Nor livelier Satirist the conscience pierce,
Awakening without wounding the touch'd heart,
Yet fare thee well - upon Soracte's ridge we part.

Oh Rome! my country! city of the soul!
The orphans of the heart must turn to thee,
Lone mother of dead empires! and control
In their shut breasts their petty misery.
What are our woes and sufferance? Come and see
The cypress, hear the owl, and plod your way
O'er steps of broken thrones and temples, Ye!
Whose agonies are evils of a day -
A world is at our feet as fragile as our clay.

Lord Byron
"Childe Harold's Pilgrimage"

CHAPTER VI

CHARACTER DESCRIPTION IN THE RHETORIC OF TRAVEL

In discussing character descriptions as introductions, digressions, and in contrast or comparison, the entire material under consideration was included in the descriptions. Attention must now be turned to areas in which the description forms only a small part of a larger rhetorical structure, and in which no secure interpretation of the description is possible without seeing it as part of that structure. Investigation along these lines may only serve to demonstrate that some of the character sketches are neutral in terms of their immediate context. Nevertheless, the establishing of such conclusions is valuable, if only because it ensures that this survey of the probable significance for the ancient reader of the character sketches in Acts is comprehensive.

A. ἔκφρασις προσώπου and the ἐπιβατήριος λόγος

Rhetorical analysis of Acts 16.6-16 requires that account be taken of a more advanced level of education than that of the προγυμνάσματα. Among the types of epideictic speech discussed by Menander the Rhetor is the ἐπιβατήριος λόγος or epibaterion, the speech of a person arriving at some place.[1] Robbins has shown how a convention developed in ancient Greek literature that the narration of sea voyages should be in the first person plural, and that hence Acts 16.11-16 reads as a first person account of arrival at Philippi.[2]

The speech which normally corresponds to the epibaterion would appear from Menander[3] to be the prosphonetikon, the speech addressed to the person arriving on his arrival. This correspondence would indeed appear to be what is found in Lucan,[4] De Bello Ciuili, VIII. 109-137 on the arrival of Pompey in Lesbos. In Acts, however, the epibateric passage follows entirely naturally upon a description of the call or summons to the place - a kletikon.[5]

That the whole of this section is not in the form of direct or reported speech should not inhibit consideration of it in terms of rhetorical prescriptions, as Cairns explains:

> "Although surviving rhetorical prescriptions for genres are naturally prescriptions for direct first-person speeches, nevertheless literary examples of genres can just as well consist of narrated speeches, either accompanied or unaccompanied by descriptions related to relevant actions; or they can even consist simply of narrations of relevant actions".[6]

Cairn's view is radical. Narratives such as we have here are examples of what he calls the 'rhetorical genres'. What is important to this study, and what may be relatively easily maintained, is that Menander's instructions show how an ancient's mind, brought up in the near ossified traditions of rhetorical education, thought about certain situations in life. He indicates what topics naturally sprang to mind for the educated man faced with the need to talk about a particular type of situation.

Ramsay was quite correct to note, although many more recent commentators have not followed him in this, that the

description of Philippi is quite unique in Luke's work. His remarks are worth quoting in extenso, for they provide an instructive contrast with what is being attempted in this thesis:

> "The description of the dignity and rank of Philippi is unique in Acts; nor can it be explained as strictly requisite for the historian's proper purpose. Here again the explanation lies in the character of the author, who was specially interested in Philippi, and had the true Greek pride in his own city. Perhaps he even exaggerates a little the dignity of Philippi, which was still only in the process of growth to become at a later date the great city of its division. Of old Amphipolis had been the chief city of the division, to which both belonged. Afterwards Philippi quite outstripped its rival; but it was at that time in such a position, that Amphipolis was ranked first by general consent, Philippi by its own consent. These cases of rivalry between two or even three cities for the dignity of the title of 'First' are familiar to every student of the history of the Greek cities; and though no other evidence is known to show that Philippi had as yet begun to claim the title, yet this single passage is conclusive. The descriptive phrase is like a lightning flash amid the darkness of local history, revealing in startling clearness the whole situation to those whose eyes are trained to catch the character of Greek city-history and city-jealousies.
> "It is an interesting fact that Luke, who hides himself so completely in his history, cannot hide his local feeling; and there everyone who knows the Greek people recognises the true Greek!"[7]

Ramsay seeks an explanation for what is unique in Acts in the personality of the author. Nock, too, explains the peculiar quality of this passage by reference to Luke's presumed individual experience, when he implies that it indicates a personal knowledge of Philippi on the part of the writer:

> "Brilliant as is the picture of Athens it makes on me the impression of being based on literature, which was easy to find, rather than on personal observation: 16.13 on Philippi affords a perfect contrast".[8]

The aim of this study is to find explanation of such matters through seeing them in the context of Hellenistic education and literature generally, and so in a way in which the ancient reader who had no knowledge of the author, but only had his book to hand, might have understood them.

Thus, without sharing Ramsay's confidence that the author is betraying the town of his citizenship, it may be agreed that this description of Philippi does relate to how a man would greet his native place on his return from abroad. From the realm of rhetorical theory there is the evidence of Menander:

> "ἐπιβατήριον ὁ βουλόμενος λέγειν δῆλός ἐστι βουλόμενος προσφωνῆσαι ἢ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδα ἐξ ἀποδημίας ἥκων, ἢ πόλιν ἑτέραν, εἰς ἣν ἂν ἀφίκηται, ἢ καὶ ἄρχοντα ἐπιστάντα τῇ πόλει."
>
> (3.231/III.377.32-378.3)[9]

In the realm of literary practice, Lucan shows how closely arrival at a foreign place may be related to return to one's native city when he has Pompey praise Lesbos by saying that it is Rome to him: "hic sacra domus carique penates/hic mihi Roma fuit".[10] Luke certainly writes of Philippi as if he were arriving there, but he gives us no reason to suppose that we are faced with anything other than Menander's second type of epibaterion.

Having discussed epibateria relating to the ruler of a city, Menander goes on:

"ἐὰν δέ τις τῷ εἴδει τούτῳ τῷ ἐπιβατηρίῳ καὶ πρὸς πόλιν θέλῃ χρήσασθαι, ἴστω ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς διαθέσεως καὶ τῆς εὐνοίας τῆς περὶ τὴν πόλιν, ὡς ἔχει, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὄψεως τῆς φανερᾶς τῆς πόλεως λήψεται τὴν χορηγίαν τοῦ λόγου ἐκ μεθόδων καὶ τῶν πατρίων μεμνημένος οἷον ἐπόθουν μὲν πάλαι καὶ γυμνασία καὶ θέατρα τοῦτα καὶ ἱερῶν κάλλη καὶ λιμένων τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως ...."

(3.238/III.382.10-16)

Not much is said by Luke about the physical situation and appearance of Philippi, but he does say that it is in Macedonia,[11] and its harbour-town Neapolis is mentioned although the relationship is not stated.

The next feature of Menander's imaginary speech is the use of the figure of priamel: "ἄλλοι μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοις χαίρουσιν, οἱ μὲν ἵπποις, οἱ δὲ ὅπλοις, ἐγὼ δὲ ἀγαπῶ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ πατρίδα . . . . " (3.238/III.382.19-21). Luke's suggestion that they might have gone to Phrygia, Galatia, Asia, Mysia, or Bithynia, but that it was ordained that they should not, is essentially a narrative equivalent of an example of this figure. This may indicate that elaboration can be achieved by the same methods in both kletikon and epibaterion but it may be that, since here the kletic and epibateric passages are so closely linked, the former is more or less included in the latter. In either case, this indication of preference for Macedonia will be encomiastic in force.

Menander's next instruction is "εἶτα ἔπαινον ἐρεῖς διὰ βραχέων τοῦ κτίσαντας" (3.238/III.382.24-25). The city is to be praised through the praise of its founder. The name Philippi itself implies its founder, and in such

a brief description as this no further explanation is required for the reflected glory to be noticed. Less obvious to the modern reader perhaps, the word "κολωνία" is probably not intended as an unbiassed statement of fact. Coloniae were Roman foundations, always made by a great military leader. Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensis was founded as a colony by Anthony, and refounded by Octavian after the battle of Actium - hence its full name.[12]

The first feature of the development (αὔξησις) of the speech which Menander suggests clearly relates principally to one's native town. It is about how one has missed the place at which one has arrived. This is to be balanced by more praise of the founder. The third heading for the development is of more interest here:

> "τρίτον κεφάλαιον, ἐν ᾧ τὴν φύσιν τῆς χώρας ἐκφράσεις, ὅπως μὲν ἔχει πρὸς θάλασσαν, ὅπως δὲ πρὸς ἤπειρον, ὅπως δὲ πρὸς ἀέρας· διεξεργάσῃ δὲ τούτων ἕκαστον συμμέτρως, καὶ ἐν μὲν τῷ κατ' ἤπειρον ἐκφράσεις πεδίων κάλλη, ποταμῶν, λιμένων, ὀρῶν ..."
> (3.239/III.383.10-15)[13]

The pattern of Menander's thought is that one should move outwards from the centre. He has previously alluded to the shrines, the acropolis, and the temples. He now moves on to the surrounding countryside. The movement in Luke's narrative is exactly the same: "ἐξήλθομεν ἔξω τῆς πύλης παρὰ ποταμόν" (16.13).

Menander then goes on to say that in cases where praise cannot be offered through the heritage of a city, it should be offered in terms of the character of the people:

"ἐρεῖς οὖν ὅτι πρὸς τοὺς ξένους φιλάνθρωπος, ὅτι πρὸς τὰ συμβόλαια νόμιμος, ὅτι μεθ' ὁμονοίας συνοικοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ ὅτι ὁποῖοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τοσοῦτοι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἔξωθεν."

(3.241/III.384.22-25)

In Acts Philippi is implicitly characterised as a welcoming city through the specific example of Lydia. Her other characteristics will be intended to be equally encomiastic of the city.

The first of these is her wealth. As a dealer in purple she is trading in one of the most expensive commodities of the Hellenistic world.[14] According to Juster[15] it was a trade in which the Jews of the Diaspora were extensively involved, to the extent that in Hierapolis the Jewish purple dyers were sufficiently numerous in the second century to form exclusively Jewish guilds. That a city should require the services of traders in this commodity was undoubtedly to its credit, contrary to the view of Palestinian Judaism that it was a trade to be despised.[16] Lydia's wealth is also reflected in her having an οἶκος, and perhaps also in her very name Lydia, for Lydia had been famous for its wealth since the days of Croesus, and for Menander it was a basis for congratulation that a man even passed through Lydia.[17]

The second possible area of encomium is that Lydia is described as "σεβομενὴ τὸν θεόν". It has been noted[18] that right religion was to be ranked above moral or physical health. Furthermore, a right attitude to the divine must have been regarded as the highest virtue, since ὕβρις was certainly viewed as the cardinal sin.

Yet wealth as a desirable attribute is the factor that must be picked out here. That it is thus encomiastic derives from the rhetorical tradition which is itself founded in conventional mores. Here it is in the first instance intended to redound to the credit of Philippi. But if what Lydia is is to the credit of Philippi, and if she is then baptised, how is the ordinary reader to avoid assuming that what she is is to the credit of the Church? It would appear that here the Church is implicitly praised in terms of conventional social values - a welcoming disposition, a proper religious attitude, and most noticeably wealth. This can be said only because it has been established that this passage relates to how an ancient would have spoken on arriving in a place, and that hence the tone of the passage should be seen as encomiastic and not just as neutrally descriptive.

In concluding, it may be noted with Haenchen[19] that verse sixteen seems to refer back rather oddly to verse thirteen. This unevenness would be adequately explained if the author felt that in going straight through to verse fifteen he was pursuing the logic of a particular type of passage, essentially descriptive in character, a logic which would be destroyed if he introduced any earlier the narrative element which begins at verse sixteen. His original readers would have been of one mind with him in this and hence would not have felt any awkwardness.

8. Ἔκφρασις προσώπου and the προπεμπτικὸς λόγος

The rhetoric of travel includes, as well as speeches on arrival, speeches on departure. The propemptikon is the

speech that bids farewell to a departing traveller.[20] Such a situation is to be found at Acts 20.36-21.16. This passage includes a brief sketch of Philip who, since he is the same man who converted the Samaritan and the Ethiopian, does not need introduction as a new figure. The same is true of Agabus. It may be that they are reintroduced simply because they have been absent from the stage for so long, but there is also another answer in terms of rhetorical theory.

Menander divides the propemptikon into three types - superior to inferior, equal to equal, and inferior to superior. The farewell of the Church to Paul would appear to be closest to the second class, for of it Menander says:

> "Ἕτερος δὲ τρόπος ἂν γένοιτο, ἐν ᾧ δυνήσεταί τις ἐνδείξασθαι ἦθος ἐρωτικὸν καὶ διάπυρον περὶ τὸν προπεμπόμενον συμβουλὴν μὴ καταμιγνὺς τῆς ἀξίας ὑπαρχούσης ἐφαμίλλου καὶ τῆς δόξης ἴσης τῷ προπέμποντι καὶ τῷ προπεμπομένῳ, ὅταν ἑταῖρος ἑταῖρον προπέμπῃ· καὶ γὰρ εἰ βελτίων εἴη ὁ προπέμπων ἐνταῦθα τοῦ ἀπαίροντος, ἀλλ' οὖν ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ τὸ ἀμφοτέρους εἶναι φίλους ἀφαιρεῖται τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς συμβουλῆς τὸν λέγοντα."
> (5.257/III.395.12-20)

It is of this second type that Menander gives a full description, slanting it to suit the classroom situation of one pupil saying good-bye to another. The orator, says Menander, should begin by complaining (σχετλιάσει) that the departure is a breach of friendship. He should appeal to his hearers as to a jury that it is contrary to the behaviour of the heroes, and contrary to nature in that it is contrary to the behaviour of animals. He should then turn again to the traveller, appealing once more to their common friendship, and also to the worth of the city the

friend is leaving. Finally in this first section, the orator will describe his own desolation ensuing upon his friend's departure. Having completed this schetliastic section, the orator should concede that the friend has decided to depart, and the addressee's praises (τὰ ἐγκώμια) should be sung systematically in terms of his parents, his city, his upbringing, and his physical appearance as appropriate. He will be asked to remember his friendship, praised in connection with the journey he is to make whether by land or by sea, led to the harbour, and finally prayed for - the prescription concluding:

> "ἡ δὲ ναῦς θείτω θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιον ἄνδρα φέρουσα, ἕως ἂν προσαγάγῃς αὐτὸν τοῖς λιμέσι τῷ λόγῳ, καταστρέψεις δὲ εἰς εὐχὴν τὸν λόγον αὐτῶν αὐτῷ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν τὰ κάλλιστα."
>
> (5.263/III.399.7-10)

Before comparing Menander's theory with Luke's practice in Acts, it will be informative to compare it with Lucan's practice in describing the people of Lesbos bidding farewell to Pompey's wife Cornelia:[21]

> ". . . . cunctos mutare putares
> tellurem patriaeque solum: sic litore toto
> plangitur, infestae tenduntur in aethera dextrae.
> Pompeiumque minus, cuius fortuna dolorem
> mouerat, ast illam, quam toto tempore belli
> ut ciuem uidere suam, discedere cernens
> ingemuit populus; quam uix, si castra mariti
> uictoris peteret, siccis dimittere matres
> iam poterant oculis; tanto deuinxit amore
> hos pudor, hos probitas castique modestia uoltus,
> quod summissa animis, nulli grauis hospita turbae,
> stantis adhuc fati uixit quasi coniuge uicto".
>
> (VIII.147-158)

This narrative presentation of the thoughts of a group of people is the clear equivalent of a speech. Lucan makes it clear that the virtual speakers and the addressee are to

be regarded as equals: "quam . . . . /ut ciuem uidere suam". This comes in the first part of the propemptikon as part of their assertion of friendship and of their consequent desolation at her departure. Lucan even goes so far as to make it clear that this sorrow is due to their sense of separation, rather than to foreboding about her future. The second part of the propemptikon is represented by the praise of Cornelia for the modesty and chastity of her nature and appearance. The scene on the shore, which Menander mentions at the end, comes in Lucan at the beginning of the passage. It is perfectly understandable, however, that where the propemptikon is a description of people's thoughts, the writer of a narrative should wish to introduce these thoughts by mentioning first the overt activity to which they gave rise. Hence, when the people of Lesbos are reduced to shaking their fists at fate, it is the nearest they can come to prayerfully wishing Cornelia all the best.[22]

This discussion of Lucan in the context of Menander's ideas has shown how, while the schoolmaster wishes to introduce his pupils to as many topics relevant to the propemptic situation as possible, the practical writer is much more economic and flexible in his presentation. The comparison of Menander's prescription with the description in Acts 20.36-21.16 is interesting both for the marked agreements and the marked differences to be noted.

Menander, as has been remarked, ends up by prescribing

prayer, at least in the case of voyages. Luke duly ends with a prayer - "τοῦ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα γινέσθω" (21.14), and such a situation has already been described at one of the earlier partings - "καὶ θέντες τὰ γόνατα ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν προσευξάμενοι. . . . " (21.5; cf. 20.36).

The idea of being escorted to the harbour in the case of sea-voyages, which is prescribed in Menander, duly appears in Acts - "προέπεμπον δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον" (20.38), "προπεμπόντων ἡμᾶς πάντων σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις ἕως ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, καὶ θέντες τὰ γόνατα ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν. . . . " (21.5).

The major element of resemblance is the schetliastic tone of Luke, which corresponds to the tone prescribed by Menander for the first half of his model. The τόπος of weeping with which Luke starts - "ἐπιπεσόντες ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ Παύλου κατεφίλουν αὐτόν, ὀδυνώμενοι" (20.37-8) - is, as in Lucan, the equivalent in action of Menander's instructions to appeal to friendship, and also to describe the desolation ensuing upon the departure.

Luke continues with mantic warnings against the journey, the first merely mentioned (21.4), the second reported in direct speech (21.10-12). Although Menander does not mention the use of prophecy, he apparently thinks that allusion to the divine or mythological is peculiarly appropriate to the sea-voyage situation:

"ἐὰν δὲ διὰ θαλάττης ἀνάγηται, ἐκεῖ σοι μνήμη θαλαττίων ἔσται δαιμόνων, Αἰγυπτίου Πρωτέως, Ἀνθηδονίου Γλαύκου, Νηρέως, προπεμπόντων τε καὶ συνθεόντων τῇ νηΐ, καὶ συνηδομένων δελφίνων τε ἅμα καὶ κητῶν, τῶν μὲν φαινόντων, τῶν δὲ ὑποφευγόντων, ὡς Ποσειδῶνος αὐτοῦ τὴν ναῦν προπέμποντος...."

(5.263/III.399.1-7)

Moreover Cicero, in his De Divinatione,[23] discusses that topic in connection with departures, and the subject of augury on departure is as old in literature as Homer's Calchas as he appears in one of the brief introductory character sketches already alluded to:[24]

"Κάλχας Θεστορίδης, οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος, ὃς ἤδη τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα, καὶ νηέσσ' ἡγήσατ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον εἴσω, ἣν διὰ μαντοσύνην, τὴν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων."

(Iliad I.69-72)

Menander cannot use augury in his complaints because these are not genuine, and he intends eventually to laud the journey:

"ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ λειπόμενον μέρος ἔλθῃς τῆς λαλιᾶς, σχετλιάσεις πάλιν ὡς βουληθεὶς πεῖσαι, εἶτα ἀποτυχών, καὶ ἐπάξεις λέγων· οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ δέδοκται καὶ νενίκημαι, φέρε δὴ καὶ τῇ βουλήσει συνδράμωμεν. ἐνταῦθα τοίνυν ἥξεις ἐπὶ τὰ ἐγκώμια ἐκ μεθόδου...."

(5.260/III.397.12-17)

One cannot say the gods are against it and then praise a man for doing it. Luke, on the other hand, intends that the schetliastic tone of the church-folk's arguments be genuine, and the dangers predicted be real. Hence, after the direct rejection of the objections by the addressee (as is possible in the dialogue of narrative, whereas it can only be implied in the monologue of display),[25] there is the pivotal acceptance of this as in Menander, but no subsequent

overt encomium of Paul's journey is offered "μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡσυχάσαμεν" (21.14). All that follows is the narrative reflection of the acceptance motif, the disciples from Caesarea going along with Paul on his journey.

A description of the journey, one of the sections which many commentators have supposed to be drawn from a diary,[26] is included by Luke. Interestingly, it is not as close to Menander's imaginative prescription for a sea journey quoted above, as to his more practical prescription for a land journey:

> "κἂν μὲν πεξεύειν μέλλῃ, διάγραφε τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν δι' ἧς πορεύσεται, οἷος μὲν ἔσται, ἐὰν οὕτω τύχῃ διὰ τῆς Θρᾴκης διιών, ἐπαινούμενος καὶ προπεμπόμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις, θαυμαζόμενος δὲ διὰ Λυδίας καὶ Φρυγίας ...."
>
> (5.263/III.398.29-399.1)

Luke's description is, of course, actual rather than a preview.

The major question, however, is whether this description of Paul's journey is in any sense encomiastic. To answer this, it is necessary to appreciate the artistic shape that Luke gives this section. It should be viewed as a single scene sustained through a period of time and a variety of geographical settings. It is a single scene because Luke maintains a constant but unfolding social setting. In terms of the actual departure, there is first of all a simple statement that Paul was escorted to the ship (20.30); then a more detailed description of the group escorting him to the shore, of the embarkation, and of the escort's return home (21.5-6); finally, the escort goes with him as far as the next staging post (21.16). Next, there is the

matter of the σχετλιασμός: at first this is inarticulate (20.37-38); then there is the statement that it became articulate (21.4); finally, there is the articulate and symbolic expression of it by Agabus, together with a statement that this was articulately supported by others (21.10-13). Thirdly, there is the matter of the rejection of this σχετλιασμός: at the first two points this is implicit, and only at the end does it become explicit and articulated (21.13). Finally, the development of the mantic element should be considered: at the first departure a future reference is included only in an allusion to what Paul himself has said (20.38); at the departure from Tyre it is said that the disciples themselves speak through the Spirit; at Caesarea there is the oracle of the prophet Agabus who is supported by a local populace amongst whom, as the reader has already been told, are included a "εὐαγγελιστής", and "τέσσαρες παρθένοι προφητεύουσαι". All this carefully constructed climactic build up is a matter of rhetorical art, and the deliberate development of a sense of foreboding and tension which is to explode at Jerusalem.

Returning to the question of whether there is any implied encomium of the Church in all this, a beginning may be made, as usual, by looking for it in the brief character sketches that occur during the course of the passage. These are:

> "ἐξελθόντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Καισάρειαν, καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά, ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῷ. τούτῳ δὲ ἦσαν θυγατέρες τέσσαρες παρθένοι προφητεύουσαι."
> (21.8-9)

"κατῆλθέν τις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας προφήτης ὀνόματι Ἄγαβος ...."

(21.10)

"ἄγοντες πρὸς ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ, ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ."

(21.16)

It has already been noted that the presence of Philip's daughters and of Agabus maintains and develops the mantic element in the propemptic situation. (Oddly the maintenance of this element involves Luke in saying that the people at Tyre tell Paul <u>through the Spirit</u> not to do what he is bound in the Spirit to do - 19.21). Whether or not Philip's status as "εὐαγγελιστής" is sufficient to involve him in this role is more of a question. It certainly contributes an ironic note. Yet, even if Philip is only reintroduced as a means of introducing his daughters, the role of developing the mantic element as already indicated is sufficient reason in itself for the presence of the first two sketches. The brief note on Mnason, lacking as it does any suggestion that he has prophetic capacities, would then be another indication that the mantic opposition is over with, and the point conceded.

It might have been thought that having so many staunch friends who were sad at his departure, or being associated with such clear sighted prophets, would have formed a basis for encomium of Paul. This would in turn have reflected back on the Church. Menander finds the description of the countries journeyed through, and presumably also of the people encountered in them, a

source for encomium. Yet, although there may be something in this for Acts, it is certainly true that Luke gives no unequivocal indication of so using his descriptions, including them as he does in a section quite dominated by the tone of συμπαθισμός. What can safely be said is that he continues his theme of the Church as speaking and prophesying the truth, a feature he marked out as praiseworthy as early as the σύγκρισις involving Ananias and Sapphira. Encomium also lies in Paul's courage in facing danger resolutely and with open eyes. But that this quality is praiseworthy is again a point which is made much more clearly elsewhere. The broad impression which would undoubtedly have appealed to the ancient reader is that of a group who know how to behave when faced with the departure of a friend.

Conclusion

Above all, this chapter has confirmed the impression of a Church portrayed in such a way as to appeal to conventional social values. In the character of Lydia there is again presented an individual whose wealth can be considered a matter of credit because in her it is combined with a generously hospitable and pious disposition, and not only does the Church include those who know how to be properly welcoming towards strangers and travellers, but also those who behave with honesty, affection, piety, and propriety when saying farewell to a departing friend. The application of conventional rhetoric is not neutral in its image-making.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry, p. 283, lists the following examples of the epibaterion as found in poetry: Alcaeus, fr. 130.16-39(LP); Catullus, Carmen 63.50-73; Homer, Odyssey, 5.229-312; Horace, Odes, 1.7, 2.6, 3.27 (included by a propemptikon); Propertius, Elegies 1.17; Tibullus, Elegies 1.3 (including propemptikon).

2. Vernon K. Robbins, "The We-Passages in Acts and Ancient Sea Voyages", Biblical Research, 20 (1975), 5-18. E. Norden, Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religioser Reder, (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1913), pp. 311-332, recognizes the existence of the convention, as do H. J. Cadbury (The Making of Luke-Acts, see index s.v. "we"), Dibelius (Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 104-5, 204-6), and Haenchen (The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, pp. 84-90), but all of these as well as many other commentators still wish to see the first person plural as reflecting, at least to some extent, a written source or diary (this sometimes being related to the fairly conventional appeal to eyewitnesses made at Luke 1.2). The ancient reader, however, with his high concern for a stylish and cultivated presentation of the history, would not have been looking for evidence of a written source obtruding like palaeolithic ruins through the tilth. If he could understand, and if indeed he was expected to understand, part of the use of first-person narration as a stylistic device, then he would have been predisposed so to understand its entire presence. Hence, whether or not it also conceals a source is irrelevant to the purpose of this thesis.

   With the vividness achieved by this "we" style of narration compare the use of the second person as prescribed by Longinus, On the Sublime, 26, and discussed by K. Gilmartin, "A Rhetorical Figure in Latin Historical Style: The Imaginary Second Person Singular", Transactions of the American Philological Association, 105 (1975), 99-121.

3. 3.238/III.382.1-9.

4. Of Lucan's close affinity with the historiographical tradition Syme remarks on Servius' commentary on Vergil, Aeneid, 1.382, "Pedestrian critics in antiquity asserted that Lucan was not a poet, but an historian" (R. Syme, Tacitus, 2 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), I pp. 142-3). Syme considers Lucan, together with Sallust and Livy, as antecedent to Tacitus.

5. Cairns, op. cit., p. 284, lists the following as examples of poetic kletika: Anthologia Palatina, 5.172 and 173 (Meleager), 5.223 (Macedonius), 12.131 (Posidippus); Horace, Odes, 1.30, 3.21, 4.5; Martial, Epigrams 8.21; Ovid, Amores, 1.31; Sappho, fr. 1,2(LP).

6. Ibid., p. 12.

7. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, pp. 206-7.

8. A. D. Nock, Gnomon, 25 (1953), 506.

9. References to Menander follow the same conventions as those to Theon (see Ch. 1, note 8, p. 28).

10. See Lucan, De Bello Ciuili, VIII.129-133, the quotation being from 132-3.

11. One cannot safely make too much of the phrase in which this information is conveyed, for while Nestle-Aland's text reads, "ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις", Haenchen's reads, "πρώτης μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις". Suffice it to say that the former is clearly more encomiastic than the latter, which is based on a conjecture that renders the text historically more accurate.

12. See article "Philippi" by T. J. Cadoux in The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2nd ed. by N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, with corrections, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), p. 186.

13. That Menander breaks into asyndeton at the end of this quotation is probably not accidental. He prescribes the use of ἐκφράσις and immediately exemplifies an aspect of its style which was noted above, Ch. II A(1), pp. 33-35.

14. Cf. e.g. Rhetorica ad Herennium IV, vi.9.

15. Juster, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, I pp. 485-7 and II p. 307.

16. See J. Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969), p. 307.

17. 5.263/III.398-9.

18. See above p. 119.

19. Op. cit., ad loc., pp. 495, 502.

20. Cairns, p. 284, lists the following as poetic examples of the propemptikon: Archilochus, fr. 79aD/Hipponax, fr. 115 (Masson); Aristophanes, Equites, 500ff.; [Erinna] ap. Athenaeum, Deipnosophistae, 283D; Euripides, Helen, 1451ff.; Horace, Epodes, 1, 10; Odes, 1.3, 1.14, 3.27 (including epibaterion); Juvenal, Satire 3 (included by syntaktikon); Ovid, Amores, 3.11 (including prosphonetikon); Paulinus, Carmen 17; Propertius, Elegies, 1.6 (including another example), 1.8, 2.19, 3.4 (including 'triumph poem'),

20. Contd. 3.12 (including prosphonetikon); Sappho, fr. 17(LP) 94(LP) (including syntaktikon); Statius, Silvae, 3.2 (including prosphonetikon); Theocritus, Idyll 7.52ff. (including prosphonetikon); Tibullus, Elegy 1.3 (included by epibaterion); Vergil, Aeneid, 4. 305-30,365-87.

21. Cf. also Cornelia's schetliastic effusions when Pompey departs, leaving her behind in the boat (De Bello Ciuili VIII.583-592).

22. Edward Fraenkel, Horace, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 35, cites Theocritus, Idyll 7,57f.; Horace, Odes, 1.3.3f.; Ovid, Amores, 2.11.41 (cf. also 9f.); and Statius, Siluae, 3.2.42ff., as examples of prayers for favourable circumstances in the context of a propemptikon.

23. See Cicero, De Divinatione, ed. Pease, index s.v. auspicia; cf. Cairns, op. cit., pp. 186, 190, 253 n.13 where he cites Tibullus, Elegies 1.3.10ff. and K. F. Smith's commentary ad loc.

24. See above p. 37.

25. Aeneas' speech to Dido (Vergil, Aeneid, 4.331-361) about the divine imperative which compels him to depart has a similar function in a similar context. Cairns, op. cit., p. 128, classifies it as a syntaktikon, the farewell of a departing traveller.

26. See note 2 above.

VII

"And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say".

(St. Luke's Gospel, 12.11-12)

CHAPTER VII

CHARACTER DESCRIPTION AND 'ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Discussion has so far centred on elements belonging to the category of epideictic oratory. Examination of character descriptions in Acts which form part of larger rhetorical structures now leads to involvement with another of the major divisions of rhetoric, that of forensic oratory. In particular, the major form or rhetorical genre of the apology or defence speech comes under consideration. Indeed, it was the need to offer an adequate defence of oneself in the Athenian courts of the fifth century that was one of the main reasons for the development of a professional interest in rhetoric in the Greek world, and which, therefore, had a significant influence on the shaping of Greek rhetorical education. Hence, particularly to the task of writing such a speech, the orator was expected, and could expect, to bring to bear all the skills acquired during that education.[1]

A. Form and τόποι in the Apologetic Genre: Acts 21.39-26.32

As preface to the analysis of this major section at the end of Acts, an illuminating illustration of the effect that the use of this rhetorical form may have on the tone of a writer can be offered in terms of the brief sketch of Ananias which appears in the earlier part of it:

"Ἀνανίας δέ τις, ἀνὴρ εὐλαβὴς κατὰ τὸν νόμον,
μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων..."

(22.12)

This should be compared with the way in which Ananias is described on his first introduction into the narrative:

"Ἦν δέ τις μαθητὴς ἐν Δαμασκῷ, ὀνόματι Ἁνανίας ..."
(9.10)

This earlier description, which is addressed to the general audience of the book, emphasises that the reader is being introduced to another disciple, and hence it follows that his obedience and courage are to be seen to redound to the credit of the Church. The later description, the dramatic audience of which is a hostile Jewish crowd, stresses Ananias's good standing relative to the Torah and his Jewish neighbours, a Jewishness only implicitly attributed to him at the earlier juncture. The form of the apology demands that Paul attempt to portray himself as keeping company at least acceptable to his hearers. It may be that in emphasising this Jewishness Luke does not allow himself to be drawn into saying anything offensive to his readership, for it contributes to an image of Christianity as non-sectarian and non-troublemaking. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that it is important to ascertain the true extent and shape of the ἀπολογία in the latter chapters of Acts if account is to be taken of the relative influence that the dramatic and the reading audience are having on the tone of the author, and hence a balanced judgment made of his intentions. Clearly, for example, it would be quite wrong to deduce from the description of Ananias in the twentieth chapter that Luke is writing for a Jewish or

strongly pro-Jewish readership.

1. Rhetorical Analysis of Acts 21.39-25.12

Aristotle, perhaps following Isocrates, makes a quadripartite division of the ἀπολογία:

> "ἀναγκαῖ' ἄρα μόρια πρόθεσις καὶ πίστις. ἴδια μὲν οὖν ταῦτα, τὰ δὲ πλεῖστα προοίμιον πρόθεσις πίστις ἐπίλογος· τὰ γὰρ πρὸς τὸν ἀντίδικον τῶν πίστεων ἔστι, καὶ ἡ ἀντιπαραβολὴ αὔξησις τῶν αὑτοῦ, ὥστε μερός τι τῶν πίστεων· ἀποδείκνυσι γάρ τι ὁ ποιῶν τοῦτο, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ προοίμιον, οὐδ' ὁ ἐπίλογος, ἀλλ' ἀναμιμνήσκει."
>
> (Rhetoric III.xiii.4/1414a)

This broad pattern of introduction, narration, argumentation, and conclusion is essentially retained in later rhetorical theory, but is of course elaborated. The result is that by the time of the Rhetorica ad Herennium, the earliest surviving exposition of the fully developed Greek theory,[2] a division into six parts is normally advocated:

> "Inuentio in sex partes orationis consumitur: in exordium, narrationem, diuisionem, confirmationem, confutationem, conclusionem. Exordium est principium orationis, per quod animus auditoris constituitur ad audiendum. Narratio est rerum gestarum aut proinde ut gestarum expositio. Diuisio est per quam aperimus quid conueniat, quid in controuersia sit, et per quam exponimus quibus de rebus simus acturi. Confirmatio est nostrorum argumentorum expositio cum adseueratione. Confutatio est contrariorum locorum dissolutio. Conclusio est artificiosus orationis terminus".
>
> (Rhetorica ad Herennium I.iii.4)

The introduction and conclusion naturally remain, as does the narration of the facts. It is the major section of the analysis of the argumentation of the case which is modified, largely in a way known to Aristotle but rejected by him, by being prefaced by an elucidation of the points actually at issue, and divided into the building up of one's own case

and the destruction of one's opponent's. In his early work, the De Inuentione, Cicero also essentially adheres to this traditional theoretical analysis:

> ". . . . tum denique ordinandae sunt ceterae partes orationis. Eae partes sex esse omnino nobis uidentur: exordium, narratio, partitio, confirmatio, reprehensio, conclusio".
>
> (I.xiv.19)

In practice, however, the different sections of a forensic speech could be expanded or compressed to the point of extinction in order to match the requirements of the situation, nor would a great orator like Cicero fear to depart from established practice, as is clearly demonstrable from his surviving speeches. The practical situation was further complicated in that the speech was not necessarily delivered straight through, but might be interrupted by the defendant himself to call for the quotation of some relevant part of the law, or in order that the deposition of some witness might be read out to the court. Both these procedures are so common as barely to require exemplification. As regards witnesses, suffice it to recall that the speech written by Lysias for the defendant Mantitheus calls for testimony on four separate occasions,[3] and that, since both the form and procedure for prosecution speeches were identical with those for the defence, the evidence of, for example, Demosthenes' speech against Meidias in which he calls for testimony on some seven occasions[4] is equally pertinent. The same speech may serve to illustrate the citing of law, which is done on five occasions,[5]

and a literary reflection of the practice may be found in the second mimiambus of Herodas, which is a humorous version of a prosecution speech.

With all this in mind, attention may now be turned directly to the structural analysis of Acts 21.39-26.29.

Although the rhetorical genre of the speech is openly declared, "ἀκούσατέ μου τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς νυνὶ ἀπολογίας" (22.1), as was earlier that of the propemptikon,[6] it is not clear where precisely the speech begins. It may begin with the introduction of the apologetic mood in Paul's rebuttal of the accusation that he is an Egyptian (21.39). His reply to the tribune's question is essentially recapitulated and expanded at 22.3, and hence there is a real sense in which it is bound in with the speech to the crowd. The speech as a whole might also be said to begin when Paul takes his stance and makes a gesture with his hand, for gesture was studied as an aspect of rhetoric.[7] Or again, it might begin with the actual address, "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες", for when Luke tells his readers that those in the crowd fell silent when they heard him speaking in Hebrew, he is not only practising προσωποποιΐα as prescribed by Theon,[8] but also indicating that these very words constitute a captatio beneuolentiae as required in an exordium. The auctor ad Herennium and Cicero remark in this connection:

> "Beneuolos auditores facere quattuor modis possumus: ab nostra, ab aduersariorum nostrorum, ab auditorum persona, et ab rebus ipsis".
>
> (Rhetorica ad Herennium I.iv.8)

> "Benevolentia quattuor ex locis comparatur: ab nostra, ab aduersariorum, ab iudicum persona, a causa".
>
> (De Inuentione I.xvi.22)

Paul's choice of language clearly falls into the first category, as did his earlier use of Greek when speaking to a Roman (21.37). It is clear, then, that in beginning the ἀπολογία Luke strives, as elsewhere, after a smooth transition without any sharply definable break between one section and another.[9]

Luke continues the exordium and captatio benevolentiae a persona nostra with an account of Paul's life. That the beginning of this, with a tripartite division of his early life marked by the past participles γεγεννημένος, ἀνατεθραμμένος and πεπαιδευμένος, conforms with a fixed formula or τόπος of ancient βίοι, has been demonstrated by van Unnik.[10] From Acts itself, he is able to offer a comparison with the description of the early life of Moses as given in Stephen's speech:

> "ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ ἐγεννήθη Μωϋσῆς, καὶ ἦν ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ· ὃς ἀνετράφη μῆνας τρεῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός· ἐκτεθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀνείλατο αὐτὸν ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραὼ καὶ ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν. καὶ ἐπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων, ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ."
>
> (7.20–22)

Further, as was elucidated in considering the form of the character sketch,[11] the use of participial phrases, of the relative pronoun, and of contrast is typical of the ἔκφρασις προσώπου. This combination of circumstances simply serves to demonstrate that, whether one discussed an individual in short compass or in more extended fashion, much the same canons applied. A further canon which Luke appears to be following here is laid down by the auctor ad

Herennium when he decrees "ordinem hunc adhibere in demonstranda uita debemus", and lays down that one should begin with the external circumstances of descent and education, proceed to physical advantages, and continue with further external circumstances and virtues or defects of character in respect of these. In so prescribing, he notes that such epideictic writing is seldom employed independently, but that in judicial and deliberative speeches extensive sections are often devoted to praise and censure. Hence Paul, in the context of a forensic speech, begins with his descent (Ἰουδαῖος), continues with his upbringing, omits all reference to physical characteristics in a way which has been noted to be typical of Luke as well as quite conventional in encomium, and continues with his further external circumstances, particularly his association with the highest authorities and his feud with the Christians, the quality of character highlighted being his zealousness for God.

Extended discussion of the defendant's life was not unusual at the beginning of an ἀπολογία. For example Lysias, one of the canon of ten orators and a source of the standards and exempla of later theory, begins his speech for the cripple with the words, "ὀλίγου δέω χάριν ἔχειν, ὦ βουλή, τῷ κατηγόρῳ, ὅτι μοι παρεσκεύασε τὸν ἀγῶνα τουτονί. πρότερον γὰρ οὐκ ἔχων πρόφασιν ἐφ' ἧς τοῦ βίου λόγον δοίην, νυνὶ διὰ τοῦτον εἴληφα . . . ."[12] Making one's defence, then, could be seen as an opportunity to make public display of an account of one's life. Certainly

Cicero in the Pro Archia, having begun with a captatio beneuolentiae from his own person on the grounds that as Archias' pupil he is acting out of pietas in making the speech, proceeds directly to an extensive description of the life of the defendant.

Both the classical practice and the self-characterisation of Paul in Acts conform broadly with the theory as expounded by the auctor ad Herennium in the context of his continuing discussion of exordium:

> "Ab nostra persona beneuolentiam contrahemus si nostrum officium sine adrogantia laudabimus, atque in rem publicam quales fuerimus, aut in parentes, aut in amicos, aut in eos qui audiunt aperiemus et si [sequitur lacuna]"
>
> (Rhetorica ad Herennium I.v.8)

Cicero appeals to his sense of duty to his teacher, while Paul emphasises his service to his country, as represented by the Chief Priest and the elders of the people.

The exordium, if not indeed the whole speech, appears to end when Paul's narration of the events of his life is rudely interrupted by the crowd (22.22). In fact this is in part only a convenient device by means of which Luke avoids repeating what practically the whole of his book has been about up to this stage, and, although he moves from direct speech to narrative, he continues with the rhetorical structure of an ἀπολογία. For it was the practice in Greek courts that certain forms of evidence were obtained under torture,[13] and it is this form of interrogation that is reflected in the threat to scourge Paul. It is an examination, not a sentence. The Roman

examination turns out to be merely verbal, but the Jewish one goes further, and that illegally. Thus, here as elsewhere, Luke is taking advantage of the greater dramatic potential of narrative over against the situation of delivering an actual speech in court. Instead of presenting the reading out of some previously recorded statement, the scenes from which such evidence would have been derived are presented vividly before the reader's eyes. Paul has spoken directly of his own life and character, and from verse twenty-two on Luke presents a form of testimony to that good character which crowns it in the way it sets Paul in comparison with his interrogator. The implications of this have already been drawn out in the chapter on σύγκρισις.[14]

The principle of σύγκρισις was also frequently used to contrast the contending parties. Early in one speech Lysias has his client say, "τὴν μὲν οὖν παρασκευὴν καὶ προθυμίαν τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὁρᾶτε, καὶ οὐδὲν δεῖ περὶ τούτων λέγειν· τὴν δ' ἐμὴν ἀπειρίαν πάντες ἴσασιν, ὅσοι ἐμὲ γιγνώσκουσιν".[15] This elaborate version of the unaccustomed-as-I-am-to-public-speaking τόπος is also used on several occasions by Demosthenes.[16] The contrast is an obvious one to make. In terms of technical analysis, it arises out of combining an appeal for the goodwill of one's judges based on one's own character with one based on that of one's opponent's, of which second form of captatio benevolentiae the auctor ad Herennium says:

> "Ab aduersariorum persona beneuolentia captabitur si eos in odium, in inuidiam, in contemptionem adducemus. In odium rapiemus si quid eorum spurce, superbe, perfidiose, crudeliter, confidenter, malitiose, flagitiose factum proferemus. In inuidiam trahemus si uim, si potentiam, si factionem, diuitias, incontinentiam, nobilitatem, clientelas, hospitium, sodalitatem, adfinitates aduersariorum proferemus, et his adiumentis magis quam ueritati eos confidere aperiemus. In contemptionem adducemus si inertiam, ignauiam, desidiam, luxuriam aduersariorum proferemus".
>
> (Rhetorica ad Herennium I.v.8)

In speaking at 22.22 of the rowdy violence of Paul's opponents, Luke has already begun implicitly to make a contrast between Paul's good character and the bad character of his opponents, and embarked upon a captatio beneuolentiae ab aduersariorum persona. This is never advanced in the oratio recta of a formal speech, rather it is brought out in an extension of the dramatic μαρτυρία. In terms of the rhetorical structure of the ἀπολογία, this is exactly what 21.20 - 23.24, the scene before the council and the story of the plot, constitute. The majority of the attributes which the auctor ad Herennium suggests would excite odium or inuidia could reasonably be said to be imputed to Paul's opponents during the course of this passage: arrogance, deceitfulness, cruelty, audacity, craft, violence, power and influence, factiousness, lack of self control, status, dubious associates, illegal associations, and finally a greater willingness to trust to these rather than to the truth to win their case. Thus there is little doubt as to the reason for the tone of this passage, and equally clearly its purpose includes the attempt to imply

that the converse of this picture of these Jews is the nature of the Church of which Paul is representative. In the process of making the case, Luke even manages to introduce a loyal member of Paul's family, even as weeping and devoted relatives of the accused were sometimes introduced into the court in order to evoke the jury's sympathy.[17] From about 21.37, therefore, to 23.24 the reader is presented with the equivalent of the exordium of a speech delivered in court. It concentrates on the good character and status of Paul, promoting this with the reader both by describing him directly, and also indirectly by implicitly contrasting him with his opponents.

The second section of a forensic speech was the διήγησις or narratio. Aristotle states that this should be relatively short, and the auctor ad Herennium follows him in this opinion: "Tres res conuenit habere narrationem: ut breuis, ut dilucida, ut ueri similis erit; . . . . "[18] In order to make his brief narratio appear the more plausibly an account of the true state of affairs, Luke puts it neither in the mouth of the defence nor of the prosecution, but on the lips of the judging party, the Romans. Cadbury rightly includes consideration of the letters in Acts with his consideration of the speeches.[19] The tribune's letter, however, is not so much the equivalent of a speech in itself, as of part of a speech, constituting the core of the narratio which may be taken broadly to include 23.25-35. The economic clarity of the passage is commendably suited not only to a narratio, but also

to the conventional character of a military figure.

The third section of a dicanic speech, which was in fact a kind of preface to the main body of the speech, was the προκαταδκευή, partitio or diuisio. The main purpose of this section was to set out the major points about which one was about to argue.[20] Hence in a defence speech it came down largely to an enumeration of the specific charges one faced. For this section Luke again does not adopt a straightforward approach, but seizes upon the dramatic possibilities of his narrative presentation. Why have the defendant recount what the prosecution have said when he can introduce the accusers to say it for themselves, or rather by the proxy of a professional orator? Hence the introduction of Tertullus, whose very professionalism may be intended to evoke sympathy for Paul in terms of the kind of argument about relative experience and inexperience that has already been cited from Lysias and Demosthenes.[21] Hence also the clearly signalled (κατηγορεῖν, 24.2), condensed but recognisable κατηγορία included within the ἀπολογία. It begins with a captatio beneuolentiae of the third type, that ab auditoris persona of which the auctor ad Herennium says:

> "Ab auditorum persona beneuolentia colligitur si res eorum fortiter, sapienter, mansuete, magnifice iudicatas proferemus; et si quae de iis existimatio, quae iudicii expectatio sit aperiemus".
>
> (Rhetorica ad Herennium I.v.8)

The mention of πρόνοια in connection with Felix's regulation of affairs (with "διορθωμάτων" compare "res iudicatas") corresponds broadly with the "sapienter" of the Rhetorica,

as does the mention of εἰρήνη with the "mansuete". The invocation of his ἐπιεικείᾳ is a flattering reference to what is expected of him. After this exordium, Tertullus briefly makes three charges: "τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον λοιμὸν καὶ κινοῦντα στάσεις", "πρωτοστάτην .... αἱρέσεως", "τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπείρασεν βεβηλῶσαι". It is interesting to compare this tripartite charge with what the auctor ad Herennium has to say about three being the maximum number desirable if using enumeratio as a technique for the diuisio:

> "Enumeratione utemur cum dicemus numero quot de rebus dicturi sumus. Eam plus quam trium partium numero esse non oportet . . . ."
>
> (Rhetorica ad Herennium I.x.17)

The diuisio achieved, Tertullus's speech is scarcely at all elaborated, as Haenchen correctly observes:

> ". . . . an accusation can in itself be verified by witnesses or by the confession of the accused. Tertullus makes use of both: he concludes by expressing the confidence that by an interrogation of Paul Felix will achieve a confession on all counts. The speech is thus quickly and elegantly ended. The witness motif is pushed through just as quickly: the members of the delegation step forward as the witnesses".[22]

Such lack of elaboration or real argumentation of any kind in the κατηγορία is entirely congruent with its standing for the diuisio of an ἀπολογία. This diuisio, then, runs from 24.1-9.

Subsequent to the diuisio the rhetor expected to move on to the main body of the speech, the whole of which had been regarded by Aristotle simply as the proof, but which was more normally divided into the building up of one's own case (πίστεις, confirmatio or probatio), and the breaking down of one's opponent's case (λύσεις, confutatio,

reprehensio, or refutatio).[23] At this point in the rhetorical structure Luke returns to Paul speaking in oratio recta. Since, although the legal situation remains the same for Paul, the actual scene has changed since he began to make his case, he is allowed to resume with a brief captatio benevolentiae ab auditoris persona which corresponds to that made by Tertullus and helps to tie the whole structure together. But Luke has Paul present the confirmatio and confutatio in the reverse order from normal, a procedure which in fact corresponds broadly with Aristotle's teaching that in his exordium a defendant should first of all set out to destroy prejudice (διαβόλη) and only then build up the positive side of his case.[24]

In Acts, then, there is first of all the rebuttal of the charges which is made in an orderly fashion: verses 11b-13 deny the charge of στάσις, partly on the ground that Paul had not been in the city long enough to develop a real insurrectionist plot; verses 14-16 deny the charge of αἵρεσις, principally on the ground that since he believes in essentially the same things as his orthodox opponents - the law, the prophets, the resurrection of the dead - it is just not reasonable to call "the way" to which he adheres a break-away sect; verses 17-21 deal with the accusation of defiling the temple, suggesting that his opponents have not provided proper witnesses or evidence, and that this is because the charge is merely a cover for a dislike of his beliefs and is brought in

the light of events subsequent to his being in the temple.[25] Thus 24.10-21 is the confutatio of the speech, a point by point rebuttal of the charges.

From 24.22-27 there is an account of a two year delay which it is difficult to interpret. Why should Luke choose this juncture to point to the corruption of a Roman offical (v.26)? Assuming that the book as a whole is addressed if not to Roman authority itself, then to an audience sympathetic to it, it would appear that the theme here brought out would give the impression of an odd inversion of the theme and intent of the normal captatio beneuolentiae ab auditorum persona.

One part of the answer to the problem may lie in this. Marcus Antonius Felix was a freedman. Upstart freedmen were not popular and their dealings were regularly regarded as suspect, doubtless frequently with good reason. This scathing attitude towards them may be exemplified by Petronius' satyrising of Trimalchio and his friends with their affluent ostentation and total lack of refinement, subtlety, or taste. One piece of gossip is particularly illuminating:

> "quid ille qui libertini loco iacet, quam bene se habuit. non impropero illi. sestertium suum uidit decies sed male uacillauit. non puto illum capillos liberos habere, nec mehercules sua culpa; ipso enim homo melior non est; sed liberti scelerati, qui omnia ad se fecerunt. scito autem: sociorum olla male feruet, et ubi semel res inclinata est, amici de medio".
>
> (Satyricon 38.11-13)

Here is a picture broadly contemporary with the career of Felix himself. It is of the meteoric rise to riches of

a freedman, and of his equally sudden fall brought about by the dishonesty of men of his own kidney, of freedmen who are classified with the epithet '<u>scelerati</u>'. If any of this common estimation of the ex-slave as unscrupulous and money-grabbing lies behind Luke's inclusion of implicit criticism of a Roman official, then it is evidence that he is not purveying a simple sycophantic political message of exculpation of the Romans at the expense of the Jews. His attitude and the attitude to which he appeals are much more subtly moulded. This kind of view, which denigrates people who do not know their place and are over-eager in their pursuit of wealth, appeals to respectable society, but also to respectable social values to which people from all strata of society might grant assent. It basically reflects conservative conformism.

This negative assessment of Felix has its converse in a positive evaluation of Paul, revealing him as a scrupulously honest and uncorruptible man - a theme by now familiar to the reader of Acts. It is this positive presentation of Paul that is probably the primary purpose of this passage, for it will then constitute the <u>confirmatio</u> in terms of the structure of the ἀπολογία. This constructive side of the argument frequently comprised a general but naturally positive assessment of the defendant, making him out to be the kind of character who would be unlikely to commit the sort of crime of which he is accused. Since, as was noted in the chapter on δύγκρισις ,[26] what a man speaks

of is to be viewed as reflecting his character, to the presentation of Paul as honest may be added a concern for justice, a high evaluation of self-control, and an awareness of a need to act in terms of an expected divine judgment (v.25). As well as having a general appeal, these characteristics are all quite deliberately presented as pointers to Paul's being unlikely to be the sort of man to rush into unruly criminal activity.

It would appear, then, that in this defence speech the confirmatio follows the confutatio. It may be assumed that, over and above the kind of background already noted from Aristotle,[27] this is not without good reason. In a normal court defence the prime aim of the ἀπολογία is to have the accused acquitted, and this will be achieved if the judge or jury can be persuaded that the specific accusations are ill-founded. Normally, although it would be nice to leave the judges with a genuinely attractive picture of the accused, this is not of the first importance. The judges may have a very low opinion of the accused, but so long as they do not find him guilty that is good enough. Hence traditional theory prescribed that the confutatio, the destruction of the accuser's case, should come second and thus be as fresh as possible in the judges' minds.

The situation in the kind of apologetic which Luke is attempting is quite the reverse. Specific charges against a particular person on a particular occasion are not his primary concern. It is not enough for him to

show that Paul should not be condemned on this occasion. Rather his primary purpose is to present a generally positive and appealing portrait of Paul, and through him of the Church. If this is accomplished, then whether or not Paul is acquitted is of secondary significance, for should the reader believe that a good man has been condemned then that too will evoke sympathy. Hence, since for Luke the positive aspect is the more important, he places it second where it will leave the greater impression on the reader's mind.

In terms of the structure of the ἀπολογία there remains the ἐπίλογος, conclusio or peroratio. The auctor ad Herennium accords it three functions, Aristotle four:

> "Conclusiones, quae apud Graecos epilogi nominantur, tripertitae sunt. Nam constant ex enumeratione, amplificatione, et commiseratione".
>
> (Rhetorica ad Herennium II.xxx.47)

> "ὁ δ' ἐπίλογος σύγκειται ἐκ τεττάρων, ἔκ τε τοῦ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν κατασκευάσαι εὖ τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ τὸν ἐναντίον φαύλως, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐξῆσαι καὶ ταπεινῶσαι, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ εἰς τὰ πάθη τὸν ἀκροατὴν καταστῆσαι, καὶ ἐξ ἀναμνήσεως."
>
> (Rhetoric III. 19. 1)

These various functions are adequately performed by Acts 25.1-11.

The task of recapitulation, to begin with the last of Aristotle's functions, is accomplished in Acts by means of the reduplication of certain motifs: the chief priests and leaders of the Jews again inform against Paul; the theme of plotting against Paul's life during the course of a journey

between Caesarea and Jerusalem returns; again a delegation goes down from Jerusalem to Caesarea to make accusations against Paul, accusations which are again described as unsubstantiated; and again Paul articulates a tripartite rebuttal, the three points of which are essentially the same as before although they come in a different order. This new order would have been more climactic from the point of view of the non-Jewish reader, for heresy or contravening the Jewish law and desecrating their temple (which would in fact have been destroyed by the time this was read) would have been much less significant in his eyes than the political crime of revolution or στάσις. Yet, since these various points which perform the function of recapitulation are presented as belonging to a new series of events, it is clear that some amplification of the case is also taking place. It is equally clear that from the beginning of this section Luke is seeking to turn the hearer against Paul's opponents, and in favour of the apostle, who is openly submissive (v.11), and who unquestionably attempts to develop an emotionally charged atmosphere. In order the more readily to develop this emotion in his reader, Luke has Paul deliver this culmination of the peroration in <u>oratio recta</u>, and the effectiveness of the rhetoric may be measured by the fame of the closing cry of appeal, "Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι."

Part of the power of this cry derives from the fact that it stands in asyndeton, a figure which rhetorical

theory recognised as being well suited to the emotional situation,[28] and which Aristotle in fact prescribes for the end of a speech:

> "τελευτῇ δὲ τῆς λέξεως ἁρμόττει ἡ ἀσύνδετος, ὅπως ἐπίλογος ἀλλὰ μὴ λόγος ᾖ· εἴρηκα, ἀκηκόατε, ἔχετε, κρίνατε."
>
> (Rhetoric III.19.6)

It has been observed that this exposition of theory is closely related to Lysias' practice at the end of his speech against Eratosthenes: "παύσομαι κατηγορῶν. ἀκηκόατε, ἑωράκατε, πεπόνθατε, ἔχετε. δικάζετε".[29] The potential power of such asyndetic rhetoric from classical times is, however, probably more familiar in modern times from the reported words of Caesar after his victory at Zela: "Veni, uidi, uici".

It would appear, therefore, that in Acts 21.27-25.11 Luke presents the complete structure of a fully fledged ἀπολογία. As with the propemptikon discussed in the previous chapter,[30] this defence speech is sustained over a prolonged period and a change of geographical setting. It even withstands a change of judge. What sustains the constancy of the scene, and thus makes it possible for the rhetorical form to persist, is that the accusers remain the same, as do the accusations, and the defendant is always Paul whose technical status remains constant as long as no judgment is pronounced. For, as the last quotations from Aristotle and Lysias suggest, it was precisely a judgment that was expected to follow, and which therefore marked the end of an ἀπολογία. At 25.12, Festus

pronounces, in epigrammatic tones suited both to the situation and to a Roman, such formal judgment as remains possible, for with his last words it is Paul who has taken control of the situation.

2. Rhetorical Analysis of Acts 25.13-26.32

The latter part of 25.13-26.32 is again an avowed ἀπολογία:

> "τότε ὁ Παῦλος ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπελογεῖτο ... ἡγημαι ἐμαυτὸν μακάριον ἐπὶ σοῦ μέλλων σήμερον ἀπολογεῖσθαι ..."
>
> (26.1-2)

> "ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπολογουμένου ..."
>
> (26.24)

Paul begins this defence speech with a captatio benevolentiae ab iudicis persona (26.2-3), buttering up Agrippa as Tertullus earlier did Felix. He goes on to a brief statement about his own life (26.4-5), a theme which has already been noted as common in an exordium.[31] Here he emphasises his Jewish birth and the orthodoxy of his upbringing as a Pharisee, calling upon "all Jews" as his witnesses, "ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν".

After such an exordium with associated μαρτυρία, a narratio might be expected. In this instance, however, it is dispensed with, as in inviting Agrippa to take an interest in the case Festus has just set out all the circumstances which might reasonably be set out in a narratio (25.13-17). Hence the effective narratio comes, as at 23.25-35,[32] from the mouth of the judging party, and with the same aura of objectivity.

26.6-7 constitutes the partitio, although in this case it is not a matter of enumerating the various aspects to be dealt with, but simply of stating the single issue which he takes to be the nub of the case.

Verse eight forms the bridge between partitio and argumentatio. It makes it clear for the first time in the speech that this hope for which he is on trial has to do with the resurrection of the dead. This is really a matter for the partitio. By heightening his style, however, and using a rhetorical question he is able to infer that no confutatio is necessary. A general case against resurrection is impossible as it is unthinkable to imply that the power of God is limited, by arguing that he is incapable of raising the dead. Thus this question, "τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν εἰ ὁ θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει;" is the confutatio, such as it is, of the speech. The heightening of style which it represents was prepared for in the apostrophising of Agrippa - "βασιλεῦ" (v.7).

The confirmatio which now follows (26.9-23), continues until Festus interrupts. Paul's argument for the resurrection of Jesus in particular is on account of his own experience plus an appeal to the prophets and Moses. Russell notes that from at least the time of Plato quotation of the poets was used as a device of authoritative support in prose literature, and that collections of quotations were made from an early date.[33] No doubt allusions here to the prophets and to the Torah are intended in the same way, and of course it has been suggested that collections of

suitable quotations from them were made.[34]

The dramatic interruption by Festus prevents Paul from indulging in extensive argumentation from scripture of the kind that the reader has already heard from Peter (1.14-36; 3.12-26) and from Stephen (7.1-53). The worst that Festus can accuse him of is the madness of an over-educated professor who is obsessed with his subject. This, of course, only serves to re-emphasise Paul's innocence as well as confirming one of Luke's apologetic themes, the educated nature of the Church. Furthermore, Paul is afforded the opportunity to reiterate the other apologetic themes of truthfulness and openness which, for Luke, stand over against the deceit and secrecy inherent in στάσις.

Luke goes as far as he dare in suggesting that Agrippa might be converted. Herein lies his ulterior motive in describing him at the beginning of Paul's speech as "μάλιστα γνώστην ὄντα σε πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν τε καὶ ζητημάτων" (26.3). He is busy reinforcing his picture of the Church as converting principally those who are already deeply involved with Judaism. Verses twenty-seven and twenty-eight present this picture in bold outline:

> "πιστεύεις, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, τοῖς προφήταις; οἶδα ὅτι πιστεύεις. ὁ δὲ Ἀγρίππας πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον· ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι."
>
> (26.27-28)

This whole passage of lively interchange (vv.24-29), with its apostrophes, exclamations and rhetorical questions indicative of the high style, and with its avowed persuasiveness, constitutes, especially in Paul's part in

the dialogue, the peroratio of the ἀπολογία. It ends with a gesture such as an orator would have reserved only for a climactic moment in rhetoric in the high style. Paul indicates his bonds: "παρεκτὸς τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων."

Once the ἀπολογία, the smoothness of which is ensured by its being based almost entirely on the life of Paul, has been rounded off in this high style which was recommended for the conclusion of speeches, it is again time for judgment. Agrippa's verdict of 'innocent' is the equivalent in Acts of Luke's centurion's belated and necessarily unavailing "ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν ".[35] Yet even with Agrippa's judgment no real argumentative progress or initiative is made,[36] for Festus has already said that he cannot see that Paul has done anything wrong. The defence speech and judgment are as much a recapitulation as the avowed recapitulation of events which Festus afforded Agrippa (25.13-27). Such a recapitulation as is thus provided in 25.13-26.32 gives the feeling of coming to a conclusion, recapitulation being assigned by the theorists to the conclusio.[37] Paul's peroration is the climax not only of his speech, but in an important way of the whole book. Agrippa's verdict, which confirms Festus' opinions, participates in and contributes to this air of achievement and finality. Other factors which contribute to this conclusive feel will come to light as the themes of the apologetic are explored, as will also the purpose of the final two chapters of the book which are there for more than their entertainment value.

Conclusion

Plümacher recognises 25.13–26.32 as a prime example, or rather as two examples, of the use of the dramatic episode in historiography such as Acts. The dramatic quality of the writing may certainly be acknowledged, as also in other passages such as 8.26–40 which Plümacher designates dramatic episodes.[38] This chapter has shown that in this passage, as in others, the dramatic quality is related to the skilful use of rhetorical structure, and it is hard to see why 25.13–26.32 should be regarded as more dramatic than 21.39–25.12. Although it may seem strange to the modern reader that the selection and disposition of the material should be so much influenced by a form of literary theory rather than reflect a more obviously straightforward attempt at narration, such handling of material and radical readjustment of sources was quite common with historiographers. For example, there is the way in which Livy reworks his source, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the case of the story of Caeso Quinctius: both, interestingly enough, begin the episode with a thumb-nail sketch of him, but while Dionysius has only one speech made in his defence, and that by his father, the great Cincinnatus, amongst other charges Livy apportions the defence among four orators as would have been the case in a formal Roman trial of his own period. He thus allows the circumstances of the rhetoric of a later date to determine the shape of part of the narrative.[39]

Returning to Acts, and with regard to the characterisation of particular individuals, the contrasts at the beginning of this extended apologetic between Paul, the Egyptian, and the Tribune have been sufficiently dealt with in chapter five, section D. Similarly, the particular emphasis in the description of Ananias (22.12) in the introduction to this chapter. The context of the ἀπολογία has shown that even the simple designation ῥήτωρ when applied to Tertullus (24.1) is not neutral, but is intended to evoke sympathy for Paul as one relatively inexperienced in judicial proceedings. Tertullus's somewhat fulsome praise of Felix (24.2-3) is a requirement of oratory, but since the object of this exaltation proves in the event to be of suspect honesty, it is interesting that Paul's appeal to him (24.10) is in quite formal terms. In this there is no doubt an element of contrasting προσωποποιία, with the professional producing the more elaborate oratory, but there is also a suggestion, later confirmed by their behaviour, that Paul's opponents are much more nearly attuned to Felix's corrupt behaviour than he. The exposure of that behaviour reveals a sophistication in the general apologetic, demonstrating that it has a strong social element as well as a more straightforward political quality. It is not a simple appeal for legal tolerance, although all such tolerance was no doubt welcome, but also a pursuit of positive respectability.

More interesting than any of these details is the disclosure, through the recognition of the application of the apologetic genre, that this section of the work is

almost entirely concerned with the characterisation of Paul. His defence is made to rest principally on his good character in such a way that, provided that the reading audience is persuaded of this, the outcome of events is not of primary importance. Thus Felix's indecisive behaviour does not raise any question about Paul's character or integrity, only about his own. Hence, contrary to Plümacher's thesis, 25.13–26.32 is not an attempt on Luke's part to gloss over by dramatic subterfuge an event in Roman/Christian relations which is embarrassing to the Church. Nor is it intended to demonstrate that officialdom is out of its depth in this area.[40] Such a suggestion would be neither diplomatic nor flattering. Rather this recapitulation, as the recapitulation at the end of any major speech, is intended as the climax and summation of his principal arguments, not least amongst which is his clear insistence that the official representatives of the state such as Gallio or Felix or Festus are perfectly competent to judge that the Church is innocent. As the whole book has been built around the career of Paul,[41] so it is summed up in an apologetic résumé of his character.

B. Themes in the Apologetic Characterisation of Paul

Three structural reasons have emerged as to why the characterisation of Paul in his final defence before Agrippa might be expected to be a summation of the theme of Acts. Firstly, Paul's career is the unifying thread or sustaining

story-line of the whole work, and therefore a brief statement of it is likely to be an encapsulation of the book's themes. Secondly, these apologetic expositions of his life, and especially 25.13-26.32, stand in an equivalent position in the book to the valedictory assessments of the obituary-like notices in other historiographers. These were often used by them to express a view on the whole history which they had just expounded. Thirdly, recapitulation such as is found in this section of Acts was associated in rhetorical theory with the final gathering up and re-emphasising of the case that had been made. This examination of the themes of Paul's apologies, and particularly of the second of the two, will, therefore, also be an exploration of the extent to which the major apologetic themes of the book as a whole are picked up and represented.

(1) Opposition and Advance

At the centre of Paul's recapitulated defence is his emphatic statement that he persecuted the church, incarcerating the faithful and voting, presumably at their trials, for their capital punishment (26.10, cf. 22.4), together with his narration of how this was followed by his adherence to the very group which he had persecuted. The nature of argument by narration is to suggest that what is sequential is in fact consequential, and so what is being put forward is that Paul's opposition to the church led, in the form of his conversion, to its advance.

This theme and pattern of opposition to the church leading to its advance permeates Acts. It is partially expounded early in the book in the speech of Gamaliel (5.35-39). Aristotle advised that argument from example was best suited to discussion or deliberation:

> ". . . τὰ δὲ παραδείγματα [ἐπιτηδειοτάτα] τοῖς συμβουλευτικοῖς [λογοῖς]. ἐκ γὰρ τῶν προγονότων τὰ μέλλοντα καταμαντευόμενοι κρίνομεν ...."[42]

Although it involves crediting Gamaliel with some undue foreknowledge in the case of the revolt of Theudas which did not occur till 44-46, Luke duly puts a couple of historical <u>exempla</u> into his mouth by which he argues his case that the church should be left alone for fear of the hybris of fighting against God. Human schemes inevitably fail, he says, and divine plans cannot be thwarted by human means. Luke is speaking to his audience through him, and his whole narrative bears out the proposition to the point that it implies not only that human opposition to divine purposes is futile, but that such action actually advances what it seeks to thwart.

From Gamaliel's speech the narrative moves rapidly to the execution of Stephen. This opposition to the church together with the activities of Saul leads directly to the dispersal and spread of the church (8.1,4) to other places and people as presented in the illustrative σύγκρισις discussed in chapter V (C). Immediately thereafter the arch persecutor himself becomes the means of the church's growth through his own conversion. Subsequent opposition to Saul only leads to the strengthening of the church through

his being united with the congregation in Jerusalem and to his going to Tarsus (9.23-31).

There is no indication that the conversion of Cornelius is the direct consequence of persecution, but it is achieved despite Peter's resistance to the invitation to eat (10.13-16), and at the end of the story is reiterated the theme of the impossibility of withstanding God (11.17, cf. 10.47). Immediately after this narrative, however, Luke reverts to the theme of how the persecution of the church actually leads to its spread both geographically and ethnically (11.19-25).

With this pattern well established, Luke offers in chapter twelve a vivid and dramatic presentation of his case that the gospel, being of God, cannot be forcibly incarcerated or contained. People like Herod who attempt it are the sort who delight in hybris and who suffer accordingly, while by contrast the word of the Lord increases and multiplies (12.24).

In Cyprus the resistance of Elymas leads to the belief of the proconsul (13.8-12). In Antioch in Pisidia opposition leads to the spread of the gospel first to the gentiles and then to Iconium (13.46-51). The same cause takes it from Iconium to Lystra, and from Lystra to Derbe (14.5-6,19). Thereafter, when the apostles move of their own free will, they in fact go back on their own tracks (14.21, cf. 15.36-40). Thus Luke emphasises what it regularly is that takes them forward.

After the welcome change in pattern in the direct

call to Macedonia (16.9), the attack by the slave-girl's owners leads first of all to the conversion of the gaoler and his family (16.33), with portentous natural events conspiring to show again that the gospel is uncontainable, and thereafter to the advance of the gospel into the rest of Greece. There opposition in Thessalonica leads to the spread to Beroea and subsequently to Athens (17.1-15). Paul's forcible presentation before the Areopagus leads to the conversion of some (17.19,34), but in the face of mockery he advances to Corinth (17.32; 18.1). Once again opposition leads to the move to the gentiles (18.5-6), and continued opposition to the punishment of opponents (18.17).

After a further period of consolidation, opposition in the synagogue at Ephesus leads to the move to the more public school of Tyrannus, and the abuses of the sons of Sceva to the growth of the Word (19.8-20).

It is at this point that there is the first mention of Paul's destiny to go to Rome (19.21). The subsequent narrative shows how it is by the opposition and hostile machinations of various parties that this is actually brought about, with an attack by Jews from Asia resulting in his arrest (21.27), more violence confirming it (23.10), a conspiracy taking him to Caesarea and Felix, and the unjust motivation of officialdom (24.26; 25.9) forcing him to appeal to Caesar and be taken to Rome. Resistance to it actually brings about the will of God, and as it does so the reader is brought again briefly to the feet of Gamaliel (22.3) as if to remind him that all that he has

read has but demonstrated the truth of the teacher's wise deliberation.

The theme of the irresistibility of God is, of course, present in the narrative before Gamaliel's overt exposition of it, particularly in the angelic release of the apostles from prison (5.19) which leads to that speech. It is present in their preaching, notably in the repeated declaration that even the crucifixion of Christ did not thwart God's purpose in him, but rather led to his resurrection, vindication and exaltation (5.30). Stephen gives more elaborate exposition of the historic opposition of the Jews to the will of God, but again only to emphasise its futility.

At the end of the book there is further grand demonstration of how nothing can prevent God's will coming to pass. For the combination of the stupidity of men and the full force of the elements in the form of a storm only serves to take Paul all the more quickly towards Rome. Herein lies the argumentative purpose of the storm narrative, a dramatic episode if ever there was one. It is the climactic demonstration of this particular argument. That human resistance should but accomplish its own confusion is one thing, but that the apparent opposition of the very elements should in fact bring nearer more quickly the achievement of the very goal in the way of which they seem insurmountably to stand, is an unsurpassable demonstration that the irresistible truth manifested in the life of the church is not merely

stronger than men, but lies at the very root or source of the universe. The argument is not, however, abandoned once it has reached this great climax, for amongst the last words of the book are some of its clearest articulations in the statements that it was the opposition of the Jews that took Paul to Rome (28.19), and that it was their historic opposition and lack of understanding that brought God's salvation to the gentiles (28.25-28). Finally, it is interesting that when Paul speaks unhindered there is no record of converts (28.30-31).

This, then is the theme that is personified in the career of Paul. It is noteworthy, therefore, that the statement "ὅθεν, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, οὐκ ἐγενόμην ἀπειθὴς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Δαμασκῷ πρῶτόν τε καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις, πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπήγγελλον μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, . . . " (26.19-20) is broadly a fulfilment of the programmatic geography of 1.8: "ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἔν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς ". As a theme, it could be read as an encouragement to people within the church at a time of persecution were it not that Luke deliberately epitomises it in a career presented before the outside world as personified by Roman officialdom. Much of the apologetic that has been uncovered in Acts is of a soft and ingratiating kind. This major theme is hard and threatening. It is not just the easy option of picking on the much disliked Jews, although their opposition to the will of God in Christ and his church is mentioned again and again. It contains a

deliberate warning to any who would contemplate such opposition, including Roman authority. Small wonder, therefore, that that warning is largely implicit and analogous, although it virtually surfaces when the prevarication of Felix and Festus leads to the appeal to Caesar.

The presence of this theme is sufficient explanation in itself of the choice of Paul as the central figure in the narrative. He personifies the transformation of opposition to the church into the means of its advancement, a transformation which proves that the church is of God. The centrality of the career of Paul to the structure of the book in turn emphasises the great importance of this strong apologetic theme.

The view that attempts to thwart the divine will only serve to accomplish it would not have been strange to the even moderately educated Greek mind. Laius and Jocasta had sought to have their son exposed in order to thwart the prophecy that he would kill the one of them and marry the other, but this only led to his being adopted by Polybus and Merope at Corinth. When Oedipus himself learned that he was destined to kill his father and have an incestuous relationship with his mother, he fled Corinth that he might never see Polybus and Merope again. He thus rushed into the very circumstances in which he both encountered and killed his father and met and married his mother. Human effort to avoid Fate was fatefully fatal, the <u>femme</u> inexorably <u>fatale</u>.[43]

In the introduction to his commentary on Acts Marshall has a section entitled 'Progress despite opposition'.[44] Luke is more concerned with progress due to opposition. The Hellenistic world would have understood.

(2) Resurrection

In the preceding section it was noted how the theme of the insuperability of God is closely related to the theme of resurrection, it being made particularly clear that the opposition which led to Jesus' death only led through his resurrection to the advance of God's purposes in him. This is the theme of Peter's preaching on the Day of Pentecost and in the Stoa of Solomon, and of his defence before Annas. The witness of the Apostles is said to be to this resurrection of an individual (4.33), and indeed Luke continues to present it thus in the case of Peter (5.30-31, 10.34-43), of the ecstasy of Stephen (7.52-56), and of Paul (13.16-41, 17.3). The presentation of the case of a particular individual and of his resurrection being a demonstration of human opposition promoting that which it seeks to thwart is the beginning of Luke's discussion of resurrection, but it is not the end.

The theme of resurrection in general, as well as that of Jesus of Nazareth in particular, is obviously a major one in Acts. If the book begins with the risen Jesus: "παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν αὐτόν" (1.3), it is the question of resurrection in general which Paul, as he stands before Agrippa, implies lies at the heart of the accusation against him (26.6-8). It is, therefore, the

burden of his apology, as is pointedly emphasised by Paul speaking of it as he is ostensibly interrupted by Festus (26.23). The form of phrase there used, "εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν", neatly makes clear that he is not just concerned with whether one man rose or not, but with the more general question of the resurrection of humankind. This point is equally clear from the rhetorical question which is the virtual confutatio towards the beginning of his speech: "τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν εἰ ὁ θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει;" (26.8). Thus, while Luke begins with the resurrection of a particular individual, he ends with his focus quite firmly on the general question.

To carry the consideration of resurrection from the particular to the general is an important, even an obvious apologetic move. Resurrection cults and associated ideas thrived in the Hellenistic world,[45] and human beings have ever been perturbed by their own mortality and have sought reassurance, often cultic. Yet at no time does Luke offer the obvious carrot and tell his hearers that if they believe in Jesus, far less go through a rite associated with him, they will defy death by being raised from the dead to the fullness of life. The direct invitation to people is to save themselves (e.g. 2.40), that is to avoid judgment and condemnation. The implications and overtones have to do with morality rather than survival. Luke's dislike of the magical has already been noted,[46] and in this careful avoidance of offering a resurrection cult another

aspect of it is revealed, and his preference for the moral dimension is simultaneously emphasised.

Luke's moral concern was early introduced into his work in a context with a philosophical background when he offered the picture of an ideal community of goods.[47] It is in a similar philosophical atmosphere that he concerns himself with the general question of the resurrection of human beings. The scene in Athens is openly one of philosophical discussion - with Epicureans and Stoics (17.18). There is allusion to the historic accusation against Socrates, that of preaching or introducing strange or foreign deities.[48] There is a suggestion that Ἀνάστασις is to be understood as a goddess, a concept in her own right. Thus the reader is not surprised when the response to Paul's mention of the resurrection of a particular, if barely specified individual (ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν), is in terms of the general question of resurrection: "ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν" (17.32). Socrates' response to the acute question of his own case, which was so distressing to his disciples, was in terms of the calm consideration of a philosophical proposition.[49] So too in Acts Luke affects the urbanity of letting the particular and pressing case of Jesus become immersed in propositions of more general import.

It is in these general terms, and within the context of this somewhat philosophical ambience, that the topic of resurrection of the dead is raised when Paul is again speaking before Ananias and the Sanhedrin (22.30-23.9). The Pharisees

and Sadducees appear as two somewhat vigorously opposed schools, with Paul presented as a member of, and in agreement with, the former. It might have been more ingenuous for Luke to have suggested that Paul was on trial because of his belief in the resurrection of Jesus, but by generalising and philosophising he is able to suggest that Paul is accounted innocent by half the Jewish people: "οὐδὲν κακὸν εὑρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ".

Having established the general question at the centre of the apology, and that with some advantage, Luke repeats it at 24.21 and develops it in the scene before Agrippa (ch. 26). Here the popular philosophical atmosphere is enhanced by the quotation of a common Greek proverb which expresses the familiar theme of the futility of resistance: "σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν " (26.14).[50] The risen Jesus himself becomes party to the debate. His own resurrection is still well in view, but it has almost become a mere exemplum for a general case.

Such, then, is Luke's apologetic handling of the theme of resurrection. It is the resurrection of Christ rather than his cross that is involved in the focal challenge for faith or belief, even as in the characterisation of Paul it is his encounter with the Risen One that makes all the difference. Thus is attention drawn away from the socially and politically more awkward execution of Jesus. Even that, however, is turned to advantage, when conjoined with the resurrection, to illustrate that not even the most potent combination of human forces can do other than advance the

divine will. For the death of Jesus is not presented as a setback which is overcome, but as itself incorporate in the divine purpose. Yet Luke's picture does not make believing that the stumbling block. That is reserved for the principle of resurrection.

Further, the general philosophical atmosphere which attaches to Paul's presentation before Agrippa would have tended further to draw attention away to an area totally non-controversial from a political point of view. Philosophical debate was eminently proper. This atmosphere would also have been intended to attract support amongst his readers in much the same way as he portrays it attracting support from the Pharisees: it is being suggested that those who have a philosophical commitment to the principle of resurrection will find in Christianity only that which will be agreeable to them. All this is part of Luke's aligning of his presentation with the respectability of philosophical religion, and in contradistinction from the mysterio-magical which finds its true level in the picaresque.[51]

(3) Piety

Paul's phrase "νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν λατρεύον" (26.7), is one which shares in an attitude of approval of piety in general which is a feature of Acts. The two themes already discussed are obviously closely related to it, both being involved with avoiding the hybris of attempting to thwart or limit the power or will of God. Also as with

the matter of resurrection, approval of piety is put on a very broad front in order to encourage as many as possible. For example, while a phrase such as "φοβούμενος τοῦ θεοῦ" may have been susceptible of a fairly technical interpretation, it clearly has a very general and conveniently embracing air about it.

Paul's reference to worshipping night and day implies approval of the piety of the Jewish people, and, in the context of the scene, approval also of Paul's zealousness and piety and of Agrippa's belief to which allusion is made in the closing exchange (26.27). This is a moderately broad spectrum in itself, but it is only reminiscent of an even wider one throughout the book. This is perhaps best illustrated from examples of people whose piety gains approval as needing only to be more correctly directed. This is true of the Ethiopian whose interests are in Judaism,[52] of the people of Lycaonia with their readiness to worship manifestations of the Greek pantheon,[53] and of Apollos with his inadequately educated zeal within the Church.[54] From Jews of Jerusalem to ladies of Philippi the image in Acts is of piety as a virtue in itself which but needs to be properly directed. The breadth of this approval is one bastion against the charge of αἵρεσις which Paul was earlier found specifically refuting.[55]

(4) A Dialectical Relationship with the Jews

The implied approval of the day and night worship of the twelve tribes together with the earlier remark, "περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων" (26.2) is reminder that the

Church stands, according to Luke, in a dialectical relationship with the Jews. It offers those aspects of Judaism which were of general appeal, such as a disciplined and organised approach which can be exemplified by the way in which disagreement is resolved by conference and discussion and the result communicated to the church as a whole (15.1-29), or by the way in which practical requirements are met by suitable appointments such as that of the deacons (6.1-6), or the sending of Barnabas to Antioch (11.22), or of representatives to a conference (15.2). Choice may even be made by lot (1.26), which had an honourable history in Athens in particular. Even the very designation ἐκκλησία may have been suggestive of conciliar good organisation. Again, in Luke's picture the Church offers the fraternity and high moral tone associated with Judaism, as well as the religious literature and untrammeled worship particularly associated with the synagogue. Use of scripture, simple acts of prayer, and instances of comradeship and generously moral behaviour are found throughout the book to an extent which renders enumeration unnecessary, though it is worth noting that all are clearly reflected in the picture of the Church in chapter fifteen.

On the other hand, and this is particularly clear in that same chapter, the Church dispenses with those aspects of Judaism which were generally disagreeable or repellent such as the requirement of circumcision, the strict dietary regulations, sabbath observance, factiousness and political

violence. These last two are particularly clearly repudiated in the chapters of Paul's apology and are to be associated with Luke's distancing of the Church from Egypt and the notorious Jewish community in Alexandria in particular.[56]

Briefly, the Church is and is not of Judaism. It offers only the very things in Judaism which it must be assumed appealed to such people as Agrippa.

(5) Connection with the Higher Echelons of Society

It is really by something of a coup that Luke manages at this stage to portray the Church as appealing to and affecting the higher levels of society. It is really rather like an incorrigible criminal airily seeking credit for knowing and being known to the judges of the High Court. Yet Luke does indeed manage to take full advantage of the circumstances of Paul's status as one accused. He is portrayed as being at his ease persuasively conversing with the likes of Festus and particularly Agrippa. This kind of association inevitably picks up the North Mediterranean kind of emphasis noted earlier,[57] as well as the penchant for the socially respectable of which Paul's own Roman citizenship is part,[58] the relatively well off with whom his Tarsean citizenship associates him,[59] and the educated classes with whom Paul's mode of speech identifies him. In the Hellenistic world it was scarcely possible to be associated with a higher social status than that of a king with the possible exception of the emperor. The Paul who speaks with a king is presented as having both

the right and the destiny to speak before Caesar. In the conversation with the king, for all his assumed wealth, there are none of the improper financial overtones which beset dealings with lesser types such as freedmen or even beggars.[60] The king listens to and is moved by an educated mode of address from Paul, whose Lord himself has the urbanity to quote a Greek proverb even if he does speak Hebrew.

(6) Lack of Secretiveness

The fact of this scene before high authority is illustration and proof of Paul's claim "οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐν γωνίᾳ πεπραγμένον τοῦτο" (26.26). This aspect of openness which is thus argued is part and parcel of that area of apology which has maintained that the Church is not involved in στάσις which necessarily involves scheming and deception.[61] It is also another way of expressing Luke's early voiced contention, so vividly conveyed in the double portrait of Ananias and his wife Sapphira,[62] that the Church is irrevocably bound to the truth. This point is further emphasised by the fact that the reader is aware that Paul is in these difficulties, such as they are, because he, like the Church, is the victim of slanderous misinformation, rather than the perpetrator of that kind of untruth. It may be recalled that the possibility of misrepresentation had earlier been raised in the context of the portrait of Apollos.[63] Finally, the close correlation of Paul's account of events with what the reader by now knows may fairly be taken to stand

as a symbol of his straightforward truthfulness.

(7) Invitation to Something with a Certain Mystique

For all the deliberate air of open truthfulness about the scene, there is also an equally deliberate impression given that Paul and the king are in discussion about a fairly esoteric matter to which both are privy. The allure of special knowledge or understanding has been offered to the reader at other points in the book, for example in the special history which forms the basis of Stephen's speech, or in the need for particular knowledge in order to interpret scripture to the Ethiopian and at other points.[64] This sense of the slightly foreign, or strange, or as yet unknown, is, however, always kept well under control. It is always presented in such a way that, as here, the reader will get the impression that it is by no means beyond his capacity to come himself fully to grasp and understand. Indeed, his reading will convey the sense that he is already beginning to do so.

The possibility of conversion, the idea that people might change their minds towards Christianity, is the second last theme to appear in the scene. As a king, Agrippa is the acme of the succession of converts or potential converts who have been portrayed during the course of the story. Yet still present is safeguard against the accusation of proselytising: it is there not merely in the fact that Paul is not actually portrayed as having finally succeeded with the king, but also because Agrippa was already familiar with the customs of

the Jews (26.3) and already believed the prophets (26.27). There is also reminder of the careful stance taken earlier in the book,[65] for Paul is not inviting Agrippa any further into Jewish belief than the degree to which he has a prior commitment, but he is introducing him to the worth of Christianity.

(8) Innocence and Justice

The scene ends, in conformity with the requirements of the rhetorical form, with the declaration by both Festus and Agrippa of Paul's innocence. This picks up the theme of innocence which has been noted at various times elsewhere, from the judgment of Gallio to the judgment of the Pharisees.[66] Closely allied to this theme is Paul's apparent fearlessness of being judged by Roman authority. This is both an indication of his own well-founded confidence and a flattering reference to the quality of Roman justice. It is also a reminder of the Church's concern for justice expressed in every reference to the Last Judgment.

Conclusion

The portrait of Paul which emerges during the course of the apologies of 21.39 to 26.32, and in particular in the scene from 25.13 to 26.32, which is created out of direct description, out of what he himself says, and indirectly out of the context in which he is found, is sufficient to remind the reader of the themes of the apologetic offered through the presentation of characters throughout the book. It does so by the artistry of

reminiscence and allusion and not by the mere arithmetic of the pernickety detailing of every aspect of every theme.

The virtue of Paul's obvious boldness might have been mentioned, but approval of the virtue of modesty might have been harder to illustrate, unless it can be found in Festus' willingness to seek a second opinion. Again, Paul's self-control can reasonably be maintained to be evident, but the virtue of hospitality cannot be said to be gathered into this recapitulatory scene unless it is to be noted in Festus' reception of Agrippa and Berenice. Any weakness in this respect is, however, amply made up for by the inclusion of the phrase "ἀπεδέχετο πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους πρὸς αὐτόν . . . " (28.30) amongst the last words of the book. Yet if some of the virtues to which the author has laid claim for the Church are at the end gathered up in the character of non-churchmen, this is not to the detriment of an apologetic which seeks to appeal to people's reasonableness or prejudice, attributes which are often the same thing seen from different points of view. For, coming from an obviously committed author, it is still an indication that the Church applauds these values, as well as a sign that the Church has the breadth of vision to recognise virtue where it exists outside the confines of its own fellowship.

The themes and qualities of character which have been exposed and explored have not proved to be astonishing, novel, or particularly innovative in the context of the

society to which they were presented. That is why it is all the more credible that they could have been recognised, grasped and heeded.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. The classical background to the analysis made in this chapter is largely the same as that to which Betz refers in order to make his analysis of Galatians - Hans Dieter Betz, A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).

2. See Ch. I, n. 14, p. 28.

3. Lysias, Oratio XVI 8,13,14,17.

4. Demosthenes, Oratio XXI. 21,82,93,107,121,167,174.

5. Ibid., 8,10,47,94,113.

6. See Acts 20.38, 21.5 quoted above p. 143.

7. Rhetorica ad Herennium III.xv.26.

8. See above pp. 11-12.

9. See above p. 36.

10. W. C. van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem, (London: Epworth, 1962), pp. 17-45.

11. See above Ch. II A.2, 3,5.

12. Lysias, Oratio XXIV.1.

13. Aristotle, Rhetoric III.xviii.8 discusses interrogation as a means of proof as part of his consideration of the use of enthymemes.
For reference in an actual speech to the practice of torturing slaves see e.g. Andocides, Oratio I.22; Cicero, Pro Milone 21.57.
Herodas, Mimiambus 2.87-91 makes reference to the practice to humorous effect.

14. See above Ch. V (D).

15. Lysias, Oratio XIX. 2.

16. E.g. Demosthenes, Orationes XLI.2.1028; XLIV.4. 1081; XLVIII.1.1167.

17. See e.g. Lysias, Oratio XX.34; Andocides, Oratio I. 148; Demosthenes, Orationes XIX.310, XXI.99.186-8; Plato, Apology, 34c.3; Aristophanes, Wasps 568-575, 976-978 and cf. Aristophanes, Wasps, ed. Douglas M. MacDowell, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971) ad loc.

18. Rhetorica ad Herennium I.ix.14.

19. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, Chapter XIV, especially pp. 190-191.

20. Rhetorica ad Herennium I.x.17.

21. See above p. 161 and notes 15, 16.

22. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, ad loc.

23. See Rhetorica ad Herennium I.x.18 ff.

24. Aristotle, Rhetoric III.xiv.7/1415a.

25. Haenchen, op. cit., pp. 657-658, makes essentially this tripartite analysis of Paul's reply, although he curiously divides the earlier accusation into only two parts.

26. See above Ch. V (C), pp. 105-116.

27. See above p. 166 and n.24.

28. See Longinus, On the Sublime, 19.2. For a good example of its use in a stressed situation see Page, Poetae Melici Graeci, no. 853, and for an example of such use in the New Testament see Galatians 1.6.

29. Lysias, Oratio XII.100.

30. See above Ch. VI (B), pp. 139-148.

31. See above pp. 159ff.

32. See above p. 163.

33. D. A. Russell, Plutarch, (London: Duckworth, 1973), p.26.

34. See e.g. Hugh Anderson, The Gospel of Mark, (London: Oliphants, 1976), p. 68 on 1.2-3.

35. Luke 23.48.

36. Were it not so, Paul would not go to Rome.

37. See above p. 170.

38. Eckhard Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), Chapter III.

39. See Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Antiquitates X.v-vii; Livy, Ab Urbe Condita III.xi.6-xiii.10; Ogilvie, A Commentary on Livy: Books 1-5, pp. 416-422; and cf. pp. 12-13 above.

40. Eckhard Plümacher, loc. cit.

41. See above pp. 74-75, 114-115, 121-123, 126.

42. Aristotle, Rhetoric I.ix.40/1368a; cf. III.xvii.5/1418a.

43. See Sophocles, Oedipus Rex, passim.

44. I. H. Marshall, The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary, (Leicester: Inter-varsity Press, 1980), pp. 27-28.

45. For general background see e.g. G. H. C. Macgregor and A. C. Purdy, Jew and Greek, (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1959), pp. 273-290; A. D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity in its Hellenistic Background, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964) pp. 105-124.

46. See above pp. 106-107, 123.

47. See above p. 102.

48. See Plato, Apology, passim.

49. See Plato, Phaedo, passim.

50. See section (1) above. For the proverbial nature of the quotation see Haenchen, op. cit., ad loc.

51. E.g. in Apuleius, Metamorphoses.

52. See above pp. 112-115.

53. See above pp. 14-16.

54. See above pp. 85-88.

55. See above p. 166.

56. See above pp. 81-83, 116-119.

57. See above p. 125 and n. 56.

58. See above pp. 125-126, 116-119.

59. See above pp. 117-118.

60. See above pp.167-168, 119-120 and Acts 3.1-8.

61. See above pp. 166, 175 and Acts 23.12-22.

62. See above pp. 102-104.

63. See above pp. 86-88.

64. See above p. 112.

65. See above pp. 86-87.

66. See above pp. 87, 189-190.

VIII

Johann Christian Fischer? Mm - the face is kindly,
the wig weil-snod, the features firmly set,
as leanan on a harpsichord by Albrecht,
wi quill in haun you scrieve a menuet.

The feet sae carefully crossed tae shaw the buckl't shuin,
gimp hose and curly cravat o white lace,
the fiddle on the chair, the music heaped -
the hail, a glisk o eighteenth Century grace!

Gin ony o your stately airs and tunefu dances
that kittle't pouther't duchesses lang syne,
culd tinkle oot o Albrecht's yella keyboard,
maist folk 'ud luik at you a second time.

But aa is dusty silence, like the derk ahint you,
and e'en your notes are naethin but a blur;
the background, fu o shadows, seems tae draw you
tae hap you in its aa-embracan slur.

Yet there you staun oot still, by Gainsborough made immortal,
as gin sic fame was shairly jist your due -
a perfect shell upon the shore left strandit,
a piece for antiquarians tae view.

Maurice Lindsay
"On Seeing a Picture o Johann Christian
Fischer in the National Gallery, Edinburgh"

CHAPTER VIII

A PIECE FOR ANTIQUARIANS TO VIEW?

Both in extent and in detail the method of rhetorical analysis has proved so thoroughly applicable to Acts that it is quite clear that the ordinary educated reader of the first or second centuries could readily have made something of the book. The susceptibility of the work to this form of analysis even makes it reasonable to accept that Luke wrote out of that same rhetorical background in education. Yet is the picture which has been revealed, as if by the stripping away of the discolouring varnish of our twentieth century preconceptions, but "a piece for antiquarians tae view"?

To a degree the approach which this study has shown to be appropriate seems to make Acts almost more remote than does the kind of approach of Dibelius and Haenchen. Dibelius talks of the story-telling interest lying behind such legends as the raising of Tabitha, the story of Cornelius, or the conversion of the Eunuch.[1] In this respect form criticism can tend to bring a work closer to people by its highlighting of the instinct for story-telling which is present in people of all ages and cultures.

Consider a case from the Old Testament:

"Nou Michal, daughter o King Saul,
  did lou young Davie dear,
And when they telt King Saul o it,
  The thing did bring him cheer.

And Saul his servants did command:
  Speak close to Davie, say:
Behold the King delights in ye,
  And aa his servants tae,

Behold the King delights in ye,
  His servants lou ye tae.
Nou then, become the King's guid-son.
  Saul's servants did een sae.

They spak thae words in Davie's lug.
  Said Davie when they'd done:
Seems it til ye a wee bit thing
  To be the King's guid-son?

For I'm a puir man, as ye ken,
  O nae repute forbye.
Seems it til ye a wee thing, then?
  Thus Davie made reply.

The servants of King Saul telt him:
  Spak Dauvid thus and sae.
King Saul said syne: To Davie thus,
  Ay thus then sall ye say:

Nae tocher does the King desire,
  Forbye ane hunder o
The foreskins o the Philistines
  In vengeance on his foe.

And when the servants Davie telt
  Thae words o royal decree,
Right weel it pleasit Davie thus
  The King's guid-son to be.

Afore the time gien him was done
  Young Davie rose betimes,
And gaed, his men and he, and slew
  Twa hunder Philistines.

And Davie brought their foreskins which,
  The number fully won,
He laid afore the King that he
  Might be the King's guid-son.

And Saul gied him his daughter fair,
  His Michal for a wife.
And Michal, daughter o King Saul,
  Loued Davie as her life.

(I Samuel 18.20,22-25a,26-27,28b)

It is the form critical approach which suggests that this story had at one time an independent existence, and that various phrases in it as it now stands in the Bible have been displaced or interpolated.[2] What is revealed is the tale of

the love of the poor boy and the princess, of bravery and adventures in his testing, superabundant success and consummation. This is the stuff of fairy tale and balladry. It is as singable as 'The Duke of Gordon's Daughter' or 'The Laird of Roslin's Daughter'[3] and the theme not dissimilar. For it to strike an immediate chord all that is required is the translation appropriate to the audience. Hence, to those to whom Scots is familiar, it may seem to cry out for the kind of verse rendering attempted above in order to illustrate the point. In all such cases, even where the story is in the Biblical version somewhat overlaid, the sense of communication, once established, will remain.

It is this kind of feeling that Dibelius' talk of legends and tales would bring to Acts. The rhetorical approach demonstrates that, even where such material may have underlain a passage in Acts, it has become unrecognisable and irrecoverable, indistinguishable from the rest of the work. In that strict sense the popular element is absent. The appeal of the book was to educated sophistication, and so perhaps it is the cultured English of the New English Bible that is suited to its translation. Even that, however, does not remedy the fact that the kind of education which was the presupposition of its writing is not generally present, even with educated people, in the latter twentieth century. Indeed, it is becoming more remote than at any time since the Renaissance. In a sense, of course, Acts was in its day as much a work of

the people as a popular story. People have, however, changed at the very point at which it related to them. Can an appropriate interaction survive that?

In terms of contemporary debate, it can also fairly be said that there is little comfort here for any who seek leverage against what they perceive to be the unwarranted middle-class domination of the Church. Acts appears to be a picture of a middle-class Church by a middle-class man for a middle-class audience, in as much as such terminology can reasonably be applied to the first century situation.

Turning from social to economic matters, it would have to be conceded that there is rather more paternalism than radicalism about Luke's approach to altering the inequitable distribution of wealth. He is more concerned with the goodness of the giver than with the God-given privileges or rights of the receiver. The redistribution of wealth is a pressing problem on the global scale in the latter twentieth century, but it cannot be denied that there was ample scope for perceiving it as a problem in the Romano-Hellenistic world.

In the political area, although Luke certainly wishes to avoid conflict with authority, there is a more steely spirit in his implicit warnings on meddling with the Church. It is, however, always difficult to translate the significance of political attitudes from a situation of authoritarian imperialism to a democratic one.

If looked on with a cold eye, there could be grounds

for an allegation of a streak of racism in Luke's preference for the Graeco-Roman over the Egyptian or south Mediterranean, and the way in which the Ethiopian is brought in as something of a decoration does not really help. His attitude here, however, is definitely not an active political one which requires the dominance of one group over another, but rather a passive cultural one. Further, it has to be weighed against his conscious and positive determination to include both Jew and gentile, without qualitative distinction, within the Church.

It is to the area of culture, if in a slightly different sense, that there is a temptation to turn in order to posit the abiding significance of Luke's work. It is tempting to say that just as a work of real art has value in and for any age, so has the book of Acts. A work of art can communicate across barriers of time and culture, and in a way that ultimately transcends analysis. Gainsborough's portrait had at least the power to make the poet write about it. Acts has proved to be a work of masterly organisation and finely worked detail. Nevertheless, the point is very difficult to maintain since the general response to Acts has been that it makes allusions to great literature, as in its use of a preface, rather than being itself classifiable as art. Evidence of its ability to command an appreciative response is lacking.

Is it then necessary, in order to maintain "that Acts is after all a book with a twentieth-century reference,

and that it speaks to our age as it has spoken to every age",[4] as Stradling does, to proceed by way of a free association of ideas and comparative sermon illustrations? Would it not be better to begin by asking why a nineteen-hundred-year-old book should be expected to match up to the contemporary situation? Its purpose was to match up to its own contemporary situation. It is in acknowledging this, and in recognising the risks which Luke took to achieve it, that the current contemporary value of the book will be realised.

A glance at the impressionistic quality of the scene in Athens will now be helpful. For in Acts the spotlight falls not on Laus Iulia Corinthiensis, the capital of the province of Achaea, the centre of things in terms of cold reality, the centre that the pragmatic Paul seems to have chosen, but on Athens, a city which was by then something of a backwater, which even according to Luke's account Paul did not much more than pass through. Yet Athens was the capital of the imagination, in the world of the litterati it was the epitome of the Greek cultural atmosphere. In order to breathe the same air as his reading public Luke carefully evokes the spirit of the place. There is mention of the Areopagus: founded as a court by the city's patron goddess Athena herself, and as an institution pushed into prominence by the Romans, it was also just the hill which gave its name to the institution. So much is Luke concerned with evocation rather than with stenography that it is not clear whether Paul

is just at the place, or whether he is in some sense on trial. Yet again there is enough of a hint of the latter, when taken together with the picture of him discussing in the Agora, with the suggestion that he is introducing new gods into the city, and with his concern with life after death, for the reader to recognise in Paul a Socrates figure, and therefore someone whom it would be wrong to persecute.

More could be said of this impressionistic evocation of atmosphere - of a city replete with altars and votive offerings, of a trendy population pursuing every latest fashion, of an interest in philosophic debate and rhetorical expertise - but what is important is not so much the content of the evocation, as the fact that Luke sees fit to create the picture, and to attempt to speak through it. Luke's aim in writing this scene, as in writing the whole book, is to enter in an educated way into the spirit of the culture in which he finds himself in order to introduce something new into that situation. Thus in Athens Paul is a philosopher, because it was philosophers who discussed matters of ultimate importance; God is spoken of in terms of Greek religion, the indigenous religion, the already understood, in order that the unfamiliar may be witnessed to through the known; the reader is not overburdened with allusion to the Old Testament, for even although the human race is seen as descended from one man, he is not troubled with his name,[5] while on the other hand Greek literature is openly quoted.

The creativity in the production of the whole book is a similar act of cultural identification by which Luke seeks to ensure that that which lies at the heart of his conviction will not be rejected merely out of hostility to its foreign appearance.

It is a risky business. To see Paul too literally as a Greek philosopher, or Christianity quite precisely as a Greek religion would be quite misleading. Luke's overall picture avoids these dangers, but he still vigorously prosecutes what is a necessary business if the Church is to be extroverted rather than introverted. He speaks the language of the outside world. He is part of a Church born in Judaism moving thoroughly into the Greek atmosphere, and such a transition is not just a matter of a move from Aramaic to Greek. As well as being a matter of verbal language, it is a matter of thought patterns, presuppositions, historical background, social values, status and activity. It is a matter of living in the culture or sub-culture from which one is coming and also in the culture into which one is moving, and in so doing being in the latter what one was in the former. Ideally, anyone attempting this demanding bridging existence should express himself entirely through thoughts, memories and behaviour already familiar to natives of his new-found situation, but with these so brought into new relationships and finding new emphases that he is not simply giving up the commitment with which he began but rather transforming the situation

into which he has entered. Acts is the product of such courageous and adventurous effort.

To accomplish this process, Luke has to have the courage to recognise virtue in some of the attitudes of the society about him, to see things that are of God in the life of the ordinary world. He has to have the courage not to despise human education, understanding and artistry. He has to have the courage to trust that the Church, even as in his presentation it is more durable than to be overcome by any political force, is also more durable than to be overcome by the assaults of cultural transformation. Thus, even as with the Church he pictures, he cannot rely on the Church preserving its identity by means of humanly obvious rituals like Sabbath observance, or strict dietary taboos, or circumcision, but must rather look to a Church which seeks to be itself in the sheer quality of its faith and life. The result is that he is able to write in a way that the ordinary educated reader of his time could have understood. By speaking through a culturally established aesthetic, he is able to create the opportunity for persuading people that what he speaks of is beautiful and true, and in so doing to begin to transform the culture through which he speaks.

If what Luke does were to be taken at the level of saying that his activity is thoroughly middle class, and therefore the Church should be middle class, then it would obviously be open to serious criticism. That, however, is to deal at the relatively superficial level

of social and ethical styles and principles. Luke immersed himself in his situation, to the point of risking himself in respect of what he most deeply believed, for the sake of what he saw to be the need of others round about him. Such an act of identification was not to deny him on whom he believed, but rather in itself to proclaim him, and to operate at the level of real living.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 4, 11-16.

2. See H. W. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel: A Commentary, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1964), pp. 158-162.

3. See The Oxford Book of Ballads, ed. Arthur Quiller-Couch, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), pp. 417-422, and The Bothy Songs and Ballads of Aberdeen, Banff and Moray, Angus and the Mearns, ed. John Ord, (first published 1930, reprinted Edinburgh: John Donald), pp. 416-420.

4. Leslie E. Stradling, The Acts through Modern Eyes, (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1963), p. vii.

5. The "ἐξ ἑνός", of 17.26 is indeed so general that it could readily have been understood in terms of the Greek myth of Prometheus making the first man from clay - cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, Callimachus, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949-53) on fragment 493.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I - Biblical Works - Editions and Commentaries

A. Old Testament

SEPTUAGINTA — ed. A. Rahlfs, 2 vols., 9th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935)

I and II SAMUEL — H. W. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel: A Commentary, Old Testament Library, (London: S. C. M. Press, 1964)

JEREMIAH — J. Bright, Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, 2nd ed., The Anchor Bible, (New York: Doubleday, 1974)

B. New Testament

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE, — ed. Eberhart Nestle, 25th ed. Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland (London: United Bible Societies, 1975)

MARK — H. Anderson, The Gospel of Mark, New Century Bible, (London: Oliphants, 1976)

LUKE — A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke, 5th ed., International Critical Commentary, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922)

ACTS — F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, New London Commentaries, (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972)

Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971)

I. H. Marshall, The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary, (Leicester: Inter-varsity Press, 1980)

Erwin Preuschen, Die Apostelgeschichte, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. 4, part 1, (Tübingen, 1913)

I CORINTHIANS — C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 2nd ed., Black's New Testament Commentaries, (London: A. & C. Black, 1971)

GALATIANS — Hans Dieter Betz, A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia, Hermeneia, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979)

II - Classical Authors - Editions and Commentaries

AESCHYLUS — Agamemnon, ed. J. D. Denniston and D. Page, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957)

ANACREON — see Poetae Melici Graeci

ANDOCIDES — On The Mysteries, ed. D. M. MacDowell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962)

APULEIUS — Metamorphoses, ed. D. S. Robertson with a translation by P. Vallette, 3 vols., 2nd ed., (Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1956)

ARISTOPHANES — Wasps, ed. D. M. MacDowell, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971)

ARISTOTLE — Ars Rhetorica, ed. W. D. Ross, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959)

Ethica Nicomachea, ed. I. Bywater (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894)

ATHENAEUS — Deipnosophistae, ed. G. Kaibel, 3 vols., (Leipzig: Teubner, 1887-1890)

CALLIMACHUS — Callimachus, ed. R. H. Pfeiffer, 2 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949-1953)

CATULLUS — Catullus, ed. C. J. Fordyce, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961)

CICERO — De Divinatione, ed. A. S. Pease, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963)

De Officiis, ed. H. A. Holden (Cambridge: University Press, 1886)

Epistulae ad Atticum, ed. L. C. Purser, 2 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903)

Orationes, vols. II & VI ed. A. C. Clark, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900 and 1910)

Rhetorica, ed. A. S. Wilkins, 2 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901-1903)

[CICERO] — Rhetorica ad Herennium, with English translation by H. Caplan (London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954)

DEMOSTHENES — Orationes, ed. S. H. Butcher, 3 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903)

DIO COCCEIANUS (CHRYSOSTOM) — Discourses, with English translation by J. W. Cohoon and H. L. Crosby, 5 vols., (London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1932-1951)

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS — Roman Antiquities, with English translation by E. Cary, 7 vols., (London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960)

HECATAEUS — see Josephus, Against Apion

HERODAS — Mimiambi, ed. I. C. Cunningham, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971)

HERODOTUS — Historiae, ed. C. Hude, 2 vols., 3rd ed., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927)

HOMER — Opera, ed. D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912-1920)

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM — On the Priesthood ed. J. P. Migne (Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca, vol. 48, Paris, 1862)

JOSEPHUS — Life, Against Apion, Jewish War, Antiquities, with English translation by L. H. Feldman, 9 vols. (London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1965)

JUVENAL — Fourteen Satires of Juvenal, ed. J. D. Duff with a new introduction by M. Coffey, (Cambridge: University Press, 1970)

LIVY — Ab Urbe Condita Libri, ed. G. Weissenborn and M. Müller, 5 vols., 2nd ed., (Leipzig: Teubner, 1899-1906)

Ab Urbe Condita I - V, ed. R. M. Ogilvie, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974)

A Commentary on Livy Books I-V, R. M. Ogilvie, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965)

LONGINUS — On The Sublime, ed. D. A. Russell, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964)

LUCAN — The Civil War (Pharsalia), with English Translation by J. D. Duff, (London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969)

LUCIAN — Luciani Opera, ed. M.D. Macleod, 3 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974)

LUCRETIUS — De Rerum Natura, ed. C. Bailey, 2nd ed., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922)

	De Rerum Natura Book III, ed. E. J. Kenney, (Cambridge: University Press, 1971)
LYSIAS	Orationes, ed. C. Hude, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912)
MENANDER (OF ATHENS)	Reliquiae Selectae, ed. F. H. Sandbach, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972)
MENANDER (OF LAODICEA)	Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν - see Rhetores Graeci
PETRONIUS	Satyricon - The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius, ed. W. B. Sedgwick, 2nd ed. with corrections, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959)
PHILOSTRATUS	Imagines, with English translation by A. Fairbanks (London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960)
PLATO	Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates and Crito, ed. J. Burnet, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924)
	Phaedo, ed. J. Burnet, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925)
PLUTARCH	Vitae Parallelae, ed. K. Ziegler, 4 vols., (Leipzig: Teubner, 1960-1980)
POETAE MELICI GRAECI	ed. D. Page, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962)
POLYBIUS	Historiae, ed. T. Buettner-Wobst, 5 vols., (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1957-1963)
	A Historical Commentary on Polybius, F. W. Walbank, 3 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957-1979)
PROPERTIUS	Elegies, Books I-IV, ed. W. A. Camps, 4 vols., (Cambridge: University Press, 1961-1967)
QUINTILIAN	Institutio Oratoria, ed. M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)
RHETORES GRAECI	ed. L. Spengel, 3 vols., (Leipzig: Teubner, 1853-1856)
RHETORICA AD HERENNIUM	see [CICERO]
SALLUST	Catilina, Iugurtha, Fragmenta Ampliora, ed. A. Kurfess, 2nd ed., (Leipzig: Teubner, 1954)

SENECA (THE ELDER) — Oratorum Sententiae Diuisiones Colores: Suasoriae, with English translation by M. Winterbottom (London: Heinemann/ Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974)

SENECA (THE YOUNGER) — Epistulae Morales, with English translation by R. M. Gummere (London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1917)

SOPHOCLES — Oedipus Rex, ed. A. C. Pearson, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928)

SUETONIUS — De Vita Caesarum, ed. M. Ihm, (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1958)

TACITUS — The Annals of Tacitus, ed. H. Furneaux, 2 vols., 2nd ed., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896-1907)

De Vita Agricolae, ed. R. M. Ogilvie and Sir I. Richmond, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)

THEON, AELIUS — Progymnasmata - see Rhetores Graeci

THEOPHRASTUS — Characteres, ed. H. Diels, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909)

THUCYDIDES — Historiae, ed. H. S. Jones, 2 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898-1902)

TIBULLUS — The Elegies of Albius Tibullus, ed. K. F. Smith, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964)

VERGIL — Opera, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

VITRUVIUS — De Architectura, with English translation by F. Granger, 2 vols., (London: Heinemann/ Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962)

XENOPHON — Opera Omnia, ed. E. C. Marchant, 5 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900)

III - Modern Authors

F. F. ABBOTT and A. C. JOHNSON, Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire, (Princeton: University Press, 1926)

C. K. BARRETT, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture no. 6, (London: Epworth Press, 1961)

G. BORNKAMM, Paul, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971)

J. A. BRINKMAN, The Literary Background of the 'Catalogue of the Nations', Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 418-427

R. BULTMANN, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1972)

A. BURFORD, Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society, (London: Thames & Hudson, 1972)

H. J. CADBURY, The Book of Acts in History, (London: A. & C. Black, 1955)

The Making of Luke-Acts, (New York: Macmillan, 1958, as reprinted London: S.P.C.K., 1968)

The Relative Pronouns in Acts and Elsewhere, Journal of Biblical Literature, 42 (1923), 150-157

Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts V, Luke and the Horse-Doctors, Journal of Biblical Literature, 52 (1933), 56-65

'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts, New Testament Studies 3 (1956-1957), 128-132

F. J. CAIRNS, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry, (Edinburgh: University Press, 1972)

H. CONZELMANN, The Theology of Saint Luke, (London: Faber & Faber, 1960)

M. DIBELIUS, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. H. Greeven, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1956)

J. DUPONT, The Sources of Acts: The Present Position, (London: Darton, Longman & Tod, 1964)

D. C. EARL, The Political Thought of Sallust, (Cambridge; University Press, 1961)

A. EHRHARDT, The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles, Studia Theologica 12 (1958), 45-79

E. C. EVANS, Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 46 (1935), 43-84

Literary Portraiture in Ancient Epic - A Study of the Descriptions of Physical Appearance in Classical Epic, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 58-59 (1948), 189-217

F.J. FOAKES JACKSON and KIRSOPP LAKE, eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols., (London: Macmillan, 1920-1933)

F. FOCKE, Synkrisis, Hermes 58 (1923), 327-368

E. FRAENKEL, Horace, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957)

K. GILMARTIN, A Rhetorical Figure in Latin Historical Style: The Imaginary Second Person Singular, Transactions of the American Philological Association 105 (1975), 99-121

A. W. GOMME, The Greek Attitude to Poetry and History, Sather Classical Lectures vol. 27 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954)

J. G. GRIFFITHS, Was Damaris an Egyptian? Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge, 8 (1964), 293-295

G. M. A. GRUBE, The Greek and Roman Critics, (London: Methuen, 1965)

Greek Historians and Greek Critics, Phoenix (The Journal of the Classical Association of Canada) 28 (1974), 73-80

N. G. L. HAMMOND and H. H. SCULLARD, eds., The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2nd ed. with corrections, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972)

E. G. HARDY, Studies in Roman History, (London: Swan Sonnenschein/New York: Macmillan, 1906)

J. MacD. HAY, Gillespie, (1914), with an introduction by B. Tait and I. Murray, (Edinburgh and Vancouver: Canongate, 1979)

C. J. HEMER, Alexandria Troas, Tyndale Bulletin 26 (1975), 79-112

G. HIGHET, Poets in a Landscape, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957)

A. M. HUNTER, Apollos the Alexandrian, in J. R. McKAY and J. F. MILLER eds., Essays in Honour of William Barclay, (London: Collins, 1976)

W. JAEGER, Early Christianity and Greek Paideia, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press/London: Oxford University Press, 1962)

J. JEREMIAS, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969)

A. H. M. JONES, The Greek City State from Alexander to Justinian, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940)

M. JONES, The Work of St. Luke: A Historical Apology for Pauline Preaching before the Roman Court. A Reply, Expositor, series 8, 9 (1915), 217-234

J. JUSTER, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain: leur Condition Juridique, Economique et Social, 2 vols, (Paris: Libraire Paul Geuthner, 1914)

E. KÄSEMANN, Essays on New Testament Themes, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1964)

L. E. KECK and J. L. MARTYN, eds., Studies in Luke-Acts, (London: S.P.C.K., 1976)

G. KENNEDY, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963)

The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World (300 B.C. - 300 A.D.), (Princeton: University Press, 1972)

G. D. KILPATRICK, Apollos - Apelles, Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (1970), 77

G. W. H. LAMPE, The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers, (London: Longmans, Green, 1951)

The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke in D. E. NINEHAM ed., Studies in the Gospels - Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955)

G. M. LEE, Two Linguistic Parallels from Babrius, Novum Testamentum 9 (1967), 41-42

H. LESÊTRE, La méthode historique de s. Luc, Revue Biblique 1 (1892), 171-185

FIONN MacCOLLA, The Ministers, (London: Souvenir Press, 1979)

G. H. C. MACGREGOR and A. C. PURDY, Jew and Greek, (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1959)

R. MADDOX, The Purpose of Luke-Acts, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982)

A. J. MATTILL JNR. and M. B. MATTILL, A Classified Bibliography of Literature on The Acts of the Apostles, New Testament Tools and Studies vol. 7, (Leiden: Brill, 1966)

E. T. MERRILL, Essays in Early Christian History, (London: Macmillan, 1924)

T. MOMMSEN, The Provinces of the Roman Empire, translated by W. P. Dickson, 2 vols., (London: Richard Bently and Son, 1886)

The History of Rome, new ed. translated by W. P. Dickson, 5 vols., (London: Richard Bently and Son, 1894)

J. MUNCK, Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times, New Testament Studies 6 (1960), 103-116

A. D. NOCK, Review of M. DIBELIUS, Aufsätze, (Göttingen: 1951), Gnomon 25 (1953), 497-506

Early Gentile Christianity in its Hellenistic Background, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964)

E. NORDEN, Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Reder, (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1913)

Die antike Kunstprosa, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1898)

J. C. O'NEILL, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, 2nd ed. revised and supplemented, (London: S.P.C.K., 1970)

J. ORD, ed., The Bothy Songs and Ballads of Aberdeen, Banff and Moray, Angus and the Mearns, (first published 1930, reprinted Edinburgh: John Donald)

A. M. PERRY, Acts and the Roman Trial of Paul, Harvard Theological Review 17 (1924), 195-196

D. PLOOIJ, The Work of St. Luke: A Historical Apology for Pauline Preaching before the Roman Court, Expositor, series 8, 8 (1914), 511-523

Again: the Work of St. Luke, Expositor, series 8, 13 (1917), 108-124

E. PLUMACHER, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1972)

A. QUILLER-COUCH, ed., The Oxford Book of Ballads, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910)

W. M. RAMSAY, The Cities of St. Paul, their influence on his life and thought; the cities of eastern Asia Minor, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1907)

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, 10th ed., (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1908)

D. W. RIDDLE, The Occasion of Luke-Acts, Journal of Religion 10 (1930), 545-562

V. K. ROBBINS, The We-Passages in Acts and Ancient Sea Voyages, Biblical Research 20 (1975), 5-18

M. ROSTOVTZEFF, Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941)

Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926)

D. A. RUSSELL, Rhetoric and Criticism, Greece and Rome 14 (1967), 130-144

Plutarch, (London: Duckworth, 1973)

P. SCHUBERT, The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts, Journal of Biblical Literature 87 (1968), 1-16

H. H. SCULLARD, From the Gracchi to Nero, 3rd ed., (London: Methuen, 1970)

A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again, Journal of Theological Studies, new series, 3 (1952), 199-213

V. H. STANTON, Style and Authorship in the Acts of the Apostles, Journal of Theological Studies 24 (1923), 362-381

J. I. STILL, The Purpose and Plan of the Book of Acts, Expositor, series 8, 14 (1917), 194-205

L. E. STRADLING, The Acts through Modern Eyes, (London: Mowbray, 1963)

R. SYME, Sallust, Sather Classical Lectures vol. 33, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press/London: Cambridge University Press, 1964)

Tacitus, 2 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958)

Ten Studies in Tacitus, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)

C. H. TALBERT, ed., Perspectives on Luke-Acts, (Danville: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/ Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978)

A. A. TRITES, The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts, Novum Testamentum 16 (1974), 278-284

W. C. van UNNIK, Tarsus or Jerusalem, (London: Epworth Press, 1962)

'The Book of Acts' - The Confirmation of the Gospel, Novum Testamentum 4 (1960), 26-59

G. WAGNER, An Exegetical Bibliography on the Acts of the Apostles, Bibliographical Aids 7, (Zürich: Rüschlikon, 1975)

F. W. WALBANK, Polybius, Sather Classical Lectures vol. 42, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press/London: Cambridge University Press, 1972)

P. G. WALSH, Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods, (Cambridge: University Press, 1961)

A. WARDMAN, Plutarch's Lives, (London: Paul Elek, 1974)

G. R. WATSON, The Roman Soldier, (London: Thames & Hudson, 1969)

D. WEST, The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius, (Edinburgh: University Press, 1969)

Multiple Correspondence Similes in the Aeneid, Journal of Roman Studies 59 (1969), 40-49

A. WHITE, Bible Characters, 6 vols., (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1901)

A. N. WILDER, Early Christian Rhetoric, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1964)

L. P. WILKINSON, Golden Latin Artistry, (Cambridge: University Press, 1963)

C. S. C. WILLIAMS, Luke-Acts in Recent Study, Expository Times 73 (1962), 133-136

A. C. WINN, Elusive Mystery. The Purpose of Acts, Interpretation 13 (1959), 144-156